DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 236 FL 020 064

AUTHOR	Jorden, Eleanor H.; Lambert, Richard D.
TITLE	Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy. National Foreign Language Center Monograph Series.
INSTITUTION	Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Japan - U.S. Friendship Commission, Washington, D.C.; United States-Japan Foundation.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-880671-00-X
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	204p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Corporate Education; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Higher Education; *Japanese; *Language Enrollment; Linguistic Difficulty (Inherent); *National Surveys; Nontraditional Education; Proprietary Schools; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to examine the depth and breadth of Japanese language instruction offered in the United States, to analyze the impact of mainstreaming instruction in one of the most difficult languages to teach, and to make recommendations leading to increased instructional effectiveness. Teachers, administrators, and students were surveyed directly, and additional information was gathered from agencies and from institutional site visits. These sources included elementary and secondary school teachers, administrators, and students; college teachers, administrators, and students; alumni of a Cornell University (New York) intensive Japanese program; 17 companies doing business in Japan, 10 federal agencies providing language training; 34 proprietary language schools; and 15 local Japanese-American societies. Data gathered included program characteristics, student characteristics, language learning problems and withdrawal rates, instructional materials, teacher characteristics, classroom practices, and student progress rates. Results in each population are analyzed separately, and a concluding section outlines general findings, the principal problems of Japanese language instruction, and program development strategies suggested by the survey results. Appended are lists of working committee members, site visit team members, and pre-collegiate conference participants, as well as charts showing survey respondents by category and institution. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342236

Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy

Eleanor H. Jorden with
Richard D. Lambert

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lambert
Richard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

National Foreign Language Center
Monograph Series

FL 020 064

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Foreign Language Center

Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy

by Eleanor H. Jorden

with Richard D. Lambert

and the assistance of Jonathan H. Wolff

Sponsored by:

United States-Japan Foundation
New York, N.Y.

Japan-United States Friendship Commission
Washington, D.C.

Copyright ©1991 by the National Foreign Language Center.

All rights reserved.

Jorden, Eleanor Harz.
Japanese language instruction in the United States : resources, practice, and investment strategy / by Eleanor H. Jorden with Richard D. Lambert and the assistance of Jonathan H. Wolff ; sponsored by United States-Japan Foundation [and] Japan-United States Friendship Commission.
p. cm. -- (Monograph series / National Foreign Language Center)
At head of title: National Foreign Language Center.
ISBN 1-880671-00-X
1. Japanese language--Study and teaching--United States. I. Lambert, Richard D. II. Wolff, Jonathan H. III. United States -Japan Foundation. IV. Japan-United States Friendship Commission. V. Johns Hopkins University. National Foreign Language Center. VI. Title. VII. Series: Monograph series (Johns Hopkins University. National Foreign Language Center)
PL520.U5J6 1991
495.6'07'073--dc20 91-41767

For more information, please write:
The National Foreign Language Center
at the Johns Hopkins University
1619 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Fourth Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Table of Contents

Foreword by Richard D. Lambert v

Acknowledgments vii

Preface xi

Introduction 1

1 Japanese Language Survey Sample 7

FORMAL EDUCATION SYSTEM

2 Pre-Collegiate Instruction 17

3 Postsecondary Instruction 69

4 FALCON Program 137

5 Non-traditional Learning Environments 145

JAPANESE LANGUAGE TRAINING AND USE

6 U.S. Companies Doing Business With Japan 155

7 U.S. Government 167

8 Proprietary Foreign Language Schools 171

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

9 Executive Summary and Investment Strategy 177

Appendix A Working Committee 185

Appendix B Site Visit Team 186

Appendix C Participants in Conference on Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Education . 187

Appendix D Pre-Collegiate Respondents to Japanese Survey 189

Appendix E Postsecondary Respondents to Japanese Survey 195

Foreword

This survey of our national capacity to teach Japanese is one of a number of similar investigations carried out at the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC). These surveys have a common focus. They are especially concerned with the overall organization of our teaching system, both inside and outside of our formal education system, with the characterization of the student clientele being served, with the general character of instructional practice, and with the use made of language competence acquired by these individuals. The surveys' purpose is to inform both public policymakers and the teachers and administrators engaged in the teaching of these languages. This is in keeping with the general mission of the National Foreign Language Center.

Richard D. Lambert
Director
National Foreign Language Center
at the Johns Hopkins University

Acknowledgments

A survey of this magnitude owes much to many people. Those of us at NFLC involved in this project think first of the many administrators, teachers, and students who spent countless hours answering questionnaires. These were not tasks that could be accomplished in a few minutes. These survey instruments were lengthy, requiring hours to complete. To all those who participated, we owe deep gratitude. Without them, the project could not have been completed.

The survey's advisory council (listed on page ix), with Senator John D. Rockefeller IV graciously serving as chairman, held two meetings, during which valuable advice was received. To Senator Rockefeller and the other council members, Richard A. Ericson, Joseph Fromm, Thomas G. Kessinger, Arthur E. Klauser, Richard J. Light, June K. Phillips, and F. LeRoy Walser, we extend sincere thanks for their participation in the project. Invited guests attending the first meeting were Ronald Aqua, Bernice Cramer, Ellen Frost, Eric J. Gangloff, and Ira Wolf. Invited guests attending the second meeting were Nancy Anderson, David Arlington, Tom Foran, Eric J. Gangloff, and Brian O'Reilly.

Also making an important contribution to the work of the survey were the members of the working committee (see Appendix A) including Emiko Konomi, David O. Mills, Hiroshi Miyaji, Tazuko Monane, Mari Noda, Charles Quinn, S. Robert Ramsey, and Robert J. Sukle. Many of this group served also on our site visit team (see Appendix B), which made a particularly valuable contribution to the project. Their visits to Japanese programs at all levels—during which they interviewed supervisors, teachers, and students, visited classes, and made tape recordings—provided an extremely important contribution to the survey as a whole. Through their direct observation, the results of our questionnaires were confirmed and critical detailed supplementary information was supplied. The site visit team members were Emiko Konomi, Mari Noda, Charles Quinn, S. Robert Ramsey, Robert J. Sukle, Patricia Wetzel and Jonathan H. Wolff.

During a meeting devoted specifically to pre-collegiate instruction in Japanese (see Appendix C), many suggestions were provided by the following participants: David Arlington, Carol A. Bond, Linda Bunney-Sarhad, Timothy Cook, June Donenfeld, Eric J. Gangloff, Sukero Ito, Fred C. Lorish, Jean Morden, and Mel Nielsen. Our thanks go to them for the useful information they provided and the interest they showed.

A number of National Foreign Language Center personnel contributed to the work of the survey during parts of the project. In particular, Daniel Baron made an important contribution to the computer-related work and data collection by telephone, at the same time, lightening everyone's load with his rare brand of humor. James DuBeau contributed to the collection of proprietary language school, business, and governmental data by questionnaire, interview, and telephone. Todd S. Krehbiel developed most of the tables that appear in the report, assisted in the management and analysis of data, and had the unenviable task of compiling the report—a seemingly endless job which he handled with impressive efficiency. Kyle Brandon kindly helped proofread. Christine Morfit, program officer, managed the publication of the final report.

A. Ronald Walton, deputy director of NFLC, and John Caemmerer, of the NFLC Russian Survey Project, were always available to offer useful help and suggestions, as the project progressed.

To the United States-Japan Foundation and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, under whose auspices this survey was prepared, we owe our deepest gratitude for unfailing support throughout the project. Their interest at every stage of development of the survey served as a constant source of encouragement to us all.

It is to Jonathan H. Wolff, Japanese language research associate at the NFLC, that we owe special gratitude. He worked enthusiastically and with extraordinary efficiency, developing the sample, distributing, collecting, and analyzing the questionnaires, at the same time answering an unending series of telephone inquiries that poured into the Center. No matter how fast the work accumulated, he always managed to stay on top, without ever losing his good humor. His was a truly spectacular accomplishment. To say that the project would not have been completed without him is neither an empty phrase, nor the slightest exaggeration.

Eleanor H. Jorden
October 1991

Advisory Council

Chairman

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller IV
United States Senate

Members

The Honorable
Richard A. Ericson
Former Ambassador to Iceland

Joseph Fromm
Chairman
International Institute
for Strategic Studies

Thomas G. Kessinger
President
Haverford College

Arthur E. Klauser
Trustee
The Mitsui (USA) Foundation, Inc.

Richard J. Light
Professor of Education
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

June K. Phillips
Director
Tennessee Foreign Language Center

F. LeRoy Walser
Director
Center for Standards and Quality in Education
The Oklahoma State University

Preface

The survey that follows is an attempt to examine Japanese language study in the United States today, for purposes that go far beyond the mere counting of programs, instructors, and students. Any such study is seriously hampered by the lack of precise vocabulary relating to language. The measure of the success of any training must obviously be determined by output—that is, the ultimate language competence of the learner—but the descriptive vocabulary in general use is imprecise and unclear. What does it mean to "know" a language? When one hears of those remarkable individuals who are said to "know 25 languages," what level of ability can be assumed for each of them? "He speaks Japanese": Is he able only to count from 1 to 10, or can he negotiate contracts for his law firm? "She reads Japanese": Is she able to read aloud, without comprehension, a passage of Japanese written in romanization, or does she read and understand editorials in the original, as carried in the Japanese press? And between these extremes and beyond are countless intermediate levels that further obscure precision.

The survey instruments used for this study, painstakingly completed by hundreds of individuals involved in Japanese language study as administrators, teachers, and learners, are of immense value, but at every step the responses require interpretation. Are instructors who "teach Japanese writing" concentrating only on isolated characters, or are they teaching the production of connected text to be judged according to native Japanese standards? Does "oral comprehension" involve isolated vocabulary or sentences, uttered with abnormal clarity and repeated several times, or do the students work with authentic Japanese conversation and lectures?

When it is found that the majority of subjects adhere to a particular pattern, it is important not to ignore the minorities who do things differently. Similarly, when the responses to questions lead to a conclusion that is an average, one should not forget the extremes and what those extremes imply for those directly affected by them.

In a word, this in-depth survey of language study has tended to point out the widespread imprecision that exists in the field and has uncovered variation that must be given serious attention. The data have been interpreted with the greatest care possible, attempting always to avoid dependence on assumptions or preconceptions.

Introduction

During the past decade, there has been a remarkable new development in foreign language study in the United States: For the first time in U.S. history, the study of a noncognate language, one outside the Indo-European family—what may be called a "truly foreign language" (TFL)—has been mainstreamed. That language is Japanese.

Until the recent past, Japanese language instruction was offered, for the most part, only at a limited number of major universities with a well-developed related area studies program. The majority of students studying this TFL were specialists in literature or history who were training to become the next generation of professors of those very subjects. Today, Japanese courses are offered in countless U.S. colleges, junior colleges, and universities—public and private, large and small, highly competitive and noncompetitive, with and without related area study programs.

Mainstreaming is being extended below the college level: In ever-increasing numbers, elementary schools and middle schools, to say nothing of high schools, are adding Japanese language instruction to their curricula. Initially, this movement began on the Pacific Rim, with Hawaii claiming the bulk of the enrollment, but today it is not unusual to find Japanese courses in institutions in eastern states as well as western. The introduction of distance-learning has brought Japanese instruction by satellite to high schools in the most remote rural areas of the United States. First and second grades may offer introductory Japanese instruction—in some cases, on an intensive basis. Outside the academic world, Japanese study is pursued in proprietary foreign language schools, government schools, business offices, and private homes. The United States is experiencing a genuine *nihongo-buumu* (Japanese language boom).

The reason for this surprising phenomenon is undoubtedly tied to economics. Although there continue to be those individuals interested primarily in the history and literature of Japan, they have been greatly outnumbered by those attracted by the current position of Japan in the hierarchy of the world's economic giants. Current student motivation for studying Japanese will be discussed in detail in the body of this study.

It is impossible to arrive at exact enrollment figures for this exploding population of students of Japanese. State boards of education are often unable to keep up with the burgeoning enrollments or even the number and identity of all the schools offering

Japanese instruction within their jurisdiction. According to figures gathered by the Modern Language Association, 23,454 college students were studying Japanese in 1986, representing a 45.4 percent increase from 1983, the highest rate of growth for any foreign language in the United States. That rate has been far exceeded in the change from 1986 to 1990 when 45,717 students represent a dramatic increase of an additional 90 percent.[1] The rate for pre-collegiate programs could be even more dramatic because a greater number of current programs at that level were not even in existence in 1986. A very rough estimate of current pre-collegiate school programs numbers about 800.

As far as can be determined, a survey of the kind undertaken here has never before been prepared for any individual language. All domestic domains of language study have been covered here—from kindergarten through graduate school, proprietary schools, business, and government—to provide a clear picture of what is actually occurring within the *nihongo-buumu*. It is hoped that this kind of inquiry, covering the nature and scope of Japanese training programs and expectations of permanence, may help in planning for organized growth. Most specialists will agree that the expansion has been too rapid to provide the backup needed in terms of qualified instructors and adequate teaching materials, including electronic software, for all levels of instruction. Similarly needed are appropriate curricular design, effective evaluation procedures and instruments, and related area studies programs. Private foundations, buried under requests for Japanese program support and viewing what appears to be a bottomless pit of need, wonder how best to allocate their limited funds. Urgently needed are a careful assessment of the goals of training in the various domains, a designation of the learning environments that have proven most successful in achieving those goals, the amount of time required to achieve desired levels of competence, and the possibility of articulation among programs. The significance of high rates of attrition at the upper levels of instruction also requires attention, as does the question of the most productive kind of curriculum for the short-term student. If appropriate action is not taken very soon, the chance for the organized development of Japanese language study will be lost forever, as instruction sinks into a morass of mediocrity, producing among the shining stars to be found here and there, widespread low-level results that give evidence of linguistic confusion. There is the opportunity for excellence, provided immediate steps are taken to halt the downward trend that is clearly developing in some areas. Surely the negative claim made by some that the situation is no better when it comes to most foreign language teaching in the United States should not be an argument for inaction. In the words of an increasing number of concerned scholars in the field, "For this language, let's do it right!" It is hoped that the survey's findings and recommendations may be of use in promoting organization and effectiveness within the expansion and in preventing the kind of rapid termination experienced by so many sudden booms.

Adding a TFL

Concurrent with the expansion of Japanese language study, there has been an increase in interest, albeit less spectacular, in foreign languages in general in the United States. The "big three" traditionally studied by Americans—French, German, and Spanish—have been joined in this trend by a number of the so-called "less commonly taught languages" (LCTLs). Actually, this latter designation is an administrative one, referring to the size of enrollments rather than the nature of the language. Both Dutch and Korean are LCTLs, but Dutch is an Indo-European language, closely related to German, while Korean, like Japanese, is also a TFL. Adding a TFL to a curriculum presents special problems and challenges.

For Americans, the study of Japanese—authentic Japanese, that is—is extremely difficult. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) of the Department of State, in its classification of foreign languages taught in U.S. academic institutions, assigns Japanese to Category 4, the language class whose members present the greatest difficulty for the U.S. learner. For example, it is estimated that 1,320 hours of instruction in an intensive program in a Category 4 language are required to bring students to the same level of proficiency reached after only 480 hours of instruction in a language in Category 1 (which includes French and Spanish). In addition to Japanese, Category 4 includes only Arabic, Chinese, and Korean, but if both the spoken and written languages are included in this comparison, Japanese emerges as probably the most difficult, even among the Category 4 languages.

The linguistic foreignness of the Japanese language seems extraordinary to English speakers. Phenomena that Americans often assume to be language universals are missing—for example, a distinction between singular and plural ("book" vs. "books"), agreement between subject and verb ("I eat," but "he eats"), and clear representation of three time zones (past, present, and future), to name but a few. On the other hand, there are innumerable features and structures not present in English or in familiar cognate languages. The U.S. learner is seriously challenged by a language that inflects both its verbs and its adjectives and even has special inflected forms for expressing the potential, conditional, passive, and others. These are very different from the "can," "if," and "be done" patterns of English. What is more, the semantic match between Japanese patterns and vocabulary and the closest equivalents in English is never perfect: Japanese X may overlap with English Y in one type of context, but elsewhere be totally different in usage and meaning.

The Japanese writing system is undoubtedly the most complex in the world. Originally borrowed from the Chinese, a totally unrelated language having a very different structure, it required extensive adaptation before it could represent the Japanese language. The system now in use consists of two syllabaries (*kana*), developed through the simplification of Chinese characters, and 1,945 approved Chinese characters (*kanji*). Each of the two *kana* sets is made up of approximately 50 symbols, which represent syllable-like units of sound having no reference to any particular meaning. One set (*hiragana*) is used primarily to represent grammatical function words and inflectional endings, and in addition, words for which there is no assigned or approved *kanji*. The second set (*katakana*) occurs most commonly in writing the Japanized form of words recently borrowed from foreign languages, particularly English. Thus the written representation of "banana" is three *katakana* symbols, each representing one syllabic unit, pronounced according to the rules of Japanese phonology.

In contrast with *kana*, *kanji* represent meaningful units (morphs), that is, sound plus meaning and are used to symbolize verbal and adjectival roots and content words, in general. Thus, *hito* ("person") and *hito* ("one") are each represented by a single *kanji* having no resemblance in shape in spite of identical pronunciation. What is more, a *kanji* typically symbolizes at least two different pronunciations, one native Japanese in origin and the other borrowed originally from Chinese. The two pronunciations, regularly referred to as "readings," usually have a similar meaning.

It is as if, in writing English, the same unit symbol "#" were used to represent "big" and "magn" or "magni," both pronunciations having a similar meaning. The reader (or writer) would determine the correct *kanji* pronunciation on the basis of context. A further complication is the fact that no spaces are left between words or phrases within a sentence. It is obvious that oral competence, acquired by all native speakers before they begin to read, greatly facilitates the development of reading skills.

The mastery of the 1,945 currently approved *kanji* is spread throughout 12 years of pre-collegiate education in Japan. In college and beyond, additional *kanji* may be introduced in connection with particular specialized subjects and the vocabulary associated with them. In other words, even for the native speaker of Japanese, fluent in the spoken language, learning to read and write is a formidable task requiring years of study. For the foreigner, particularly one who is not proficient in the language, it is particularly difficult.

The kinds of difficulties that have been described thus far all relate to Japanese as a linguistic code. This is only part of the foreign learner's problem. Japanese is spoken within a society whose rules of social conduct are very different from those in the West. The deep culture—the mind-set—of the Japanese determines the way they behave, interact, and react in their daily lives, and this has a direct influence on the way they talk and hear and read and write. Authentic Japanese is not a translation of the English appropriate to a given situation. That is to say, the student of Japanese must be concerned with language *in* culture—the Japanese language as it is used within Japanese society, following the patterns of Japanese behavior. This kind of culture is acquired—not learned—by cultural natives just as they acquire their native spoken language: unconsciously and without awareness.

A curriculum described in terms of "language *and* culture," with language taught simply as a linguistic code—covering grammar rules, but no underlying rules of interaction—and culture limited to the consciously and deliberately *learned* variety, leaves students in the dark as to the production and interpretation of authentic Japanese language. In fact, foreigners who have learned how to interact with Japanese with appropriate behavior, even if they know no Japanese language, can communicate more successfully than those who have studied the language in terms of isolated vocabulary or sentences or even passages, translated from English, with no notion as to when or where or by whom those language samples would ever—if ever—be used within Japanese society.

The learned variety of culture—from the study of art and literature to making sushi and folding paper cranes—should never be underrated, but at the same time, it should not be identified as part of a language curriculum when it is studied through the use of English. In no way does it improve the foreign language competence of the student. If literature or history or economics is being read in Japanese, this is of course relevant to language study, but one must be careful not to identify instruction on any nonlinguistic topic that relies entirely on English as language learning, crucial as such subjects are to the development of a language-and-area curriculum.

The emphasis given to acquired culture in the study of Japanese is not to suggest that this is unimportant when studying languages that are linguistically related to English. However, just as such languages are linguistically cognate with English, the cultures in which they are native also tend to be more closely related to that of the United States. Even the untrained student probably makes fewer and less serious intercultural errors when dealing with members of a "cognate society."

An example of a feature of acquired culture reflected in the Japanese language is the total lack of a stylistically neutral level. Japanese are constantly aware of the way they relate to their addressees and those about whom they are talking. There is no neutral equivalent for an English utterance like "Are you studying Japanese?" In Japanese, even the simplest utterance is overtly marked for degrees of politeness and distancing, depending on the speaker, the addressee, others present, the general topic, the occasion, and other factors. And in some settings, all alternatives become unacceptable—that is to say, certain questions or comments are socially inappropriate in any stylistic variant. Predictions cannot be made on the basis of the occurrences of the closest English equivalent. Thus, determination of the appropriate forms in any given setting is a foreigner's nightmare.

A constant dependence on the native speakers' tolerance of foreigners' errors is dangerous. One can never be sure as to when an error—unintentional though it may be—will be of a type too serious to be overlooked in the native speakers' cultural system.

The addition of a TFL to a curriculum—particularly a TFL that belongs to Category 4—calls for the realization that this language is very different indeed from languages cognate with English and an awareness of special requirements for developing a curriculum appropriate for U.S. learners. What are realistic goals in the given setting? How do they match those of the students? How is it possible to develop an effective *program* in a Category 4 language—one that moves students along a well-structured course of study, of maximum benefit both to those who study briefly and to those who require articulation with more advanced study?

Methodology of the Survey

The purpose of conducting this survey has been to examine in depth the kinds of Japanese language instruction currently available in the United States, to analyze the impact of mainstreaming a Category 4 language, and to make recommendations that will lead to increased effectiveness. One type of data collection entailed gathering and analyzing detailed survey instruments from representatives of the relevant domains; additional statistics were gathered by direct contact with appropriate agencies, and selected institutions were visited and observed by case study workers for in-depth study.

Endnotes

1. Modern Language Association, *Fall 1990 Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Colleges and Universities*, (New York: MLA, 1991).

ONE

Japanese Language Survey Sample

The following discussion is based on an examination of the formal education system which consists of the pre-collegiate and postsecondary domains as well as language training and utilization in proprietary language programs, business and government. This examination was conducted with formal survey instruments, interviews, and site visits in addition to a survey of the existing literature.

Formal Education System: Pre-Collegiate Survey

Survey Instruments. Questionnaires were developed for principals and Japanese language teachers at the elementary and secondary school levels, as well as for students currently studying Japanese in high school and former students now in college. These questionnaires were distributed in packets to 78 schools, including 60 high schools, 9 middle schools, and 9 elementary schools primarily in 4 states: Indiana, Michigan, New York, and Oregon. These states were chosen because of the number of Japanese programs in each state, to provide a regional balance, and to reflect a variety of administrative types. The individual schools were selected after consultation with the respective state department of education foreign language representatives to identify programs that would be most likely to provide substantive information. Five high schools from four different states that participated in a parallel National Foreign Language Center study of the Dodge Foundation Chinese language programs were also included. (See Table 1.1.) The schools were then contacted by telephone and their cooperation elicited. The principals and Japanese language teachers at each school were sent individually the pertinent questionnaires. High school teachers also received student questionnaires with the request that these be distributed to all their Japanese language students. To provide a more general representation at the national level, teacher forms were distributed nationwide to an additional 278 high schools listed in the December 1989 Japanese Language Teachers Network newsletter. It should be noted that a few schools had more than one instructor and several teachers taught at more than one institution. A survey instrument for current college students who had studied Japanese in high school was also developed and distributed to 203 alumni from 8 high schools that were able to provide addresses and from 9 cooperating postsecondary institutions. (See

Table 1.2. and 1.3.) The geographic distribution of schools that provided data for the NFLC sample is comparable to the list of pre-collegiate programs compiled by the Association of Teachers of Japanese (ATJ). (See Table 1.4.) For a complete listing of participating schools and the types of questionnaires returned, see Appendix D.

Table 1.1: Distribution of Pre-Collegiate Schools Sent Survey Instruments by Location and Type of Institution

	Type of Pre-Collegiate Institution			
Location of School	**Elementary**	**Middle**	**High**	**Total**
Four State Sample				
Indiana	1	3	18	22
Michigan	2	1	8	11
New York	3	2	8	13
Oregon	3	3	21	27
Dodge School Sample				
Alaska	0	0	2	2
New Hampshire	0	0	1	1
Oklahoma	0	0	1	1
Virginia	0	0	1	1
Total	9	9	60	78

Table 1.2: Number of Pre-Collegiate Survey Forms Distributed by Type of School and Instrument

	Type of Pre-Collegiate Institution			
Instrument	**Elementary**	**Middle**	**High School**	**Total**
Principals	9	9	60	78
Teachers (4 state sample)	10	9	60	79
Teachers (national sample)	0	0	278	278
Current High School Students	0	0	2,364	2,364
High School Alumni	0	0	203	203
Total	19	18	2,965	3,002

Number of Pre-Collegiate Survey Forms Returned by Type of School and Instrument

	Type of Pre-Collegiate Institution			
Instrument	**Elementary**	**Middle**	**High School**	**Total**
Principals	3	3	33	39
Teachers (4 state sample)	4	3	35	41
Teachers (national sample)	0	0	105	105
Current High School Students	0	0	1,185	1,185
High School Alumni	0	0	100	100
Total	7	6	1,458	1,471

Table 1.3: Pre-Collegiate Survey Response Rate by Instrument

Instrument	Total Number of Instruments Distributed	Total Number of Instruments Returned	Response Rate
			Percent
Principals	78	39	50.0
Teachers (4 state sample)	79	41	51.9
Teachers (national sample)	278	105	37.8
Current High School students	2,364	1,185	50.1
High School Alumni	203	100	49.3
Total	3,002	1,471	49.0

Table 1.4: Comparison of NFLC Pre-Collegiate Sample to ATJ List of Pre-Collegiate Programs[1]

Region	ATJ[1]		NFLC Survey	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Northeast	56	9.7	18	12.3
South Atlantic	67	11.6	11	7.6
Midwest	120	20.8	39	26.7
South Central	29	5.0	2	1.4
Rocky Mountain	25	4.4	10	6.8
Pacific Coast	280	48.5	66	45.2
Totals	577	100.0	146	100.0

[1] Does not include 288 distance learning programs.
Source: Association of Teachers of Japanese, 1990, National Foreign Language Center, 1991 data.

Site Visits. To examine issues that could not be addressed through questionnaires, site visits were conducted by several leaders in the field of Japanese language pedagogy and by members of the NFLC survey project staff. Eight high schools and two middle schools were visited: two in the Pacific Northwest, four in the Midwest, two in a major East Coast city, and two in Mid-Atlantic suburban communities. Three elementary school programs were also visited: one on the West Coast, one in the Midwest and one in the East. A summer "governor's school," featuring Japanese language instruction and a summer language program offering Japanese for high school credit, was also visited.

Formal Education System: Postsecondary Survey

Survey Instruments. For the postsecondary level, two samples were drawn from a list provided by the Modern Language Association (MLA) of 412 institutions offering Japanese. A targeted sample of 47 institutions was developed on the basis of institutional type, location, and type and history of Japanese language programs. These targeted institutions were sent detailed survey instruments for program administrators, teachers, and students. The remaining 365 institutions were sent a more general survey instrument containing a subset of the questions asked of those in the targeted sample. The teachers' form was also distributed at the 1990 meeting of the Association for Asian Studies (AAS). Separate instruments were developed for teachers participating in Exchange: Japan's Educational Exchange Program (EEP)[1] and for students studying Japanese through the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP). Table 1.5 illustrates the distribution of the postsecondary survey sample. For a complete listing of participating postsecondary institutions and the types of questionnaires returned, see Appendix E.

Table 1.5: Postsecondary Survey Sample

Instrument	No. of Schools Sent Forms	No. of Schools with Returned Forms	No. of Forms Returned
Target Sample	47	45	
Administrators		35	35
Students		44	635
Teachers[1]		35	106
General Sample	365		
General Postsecondary		156	156
Teachers[1] (AAS)		14	25
Specialized Surveys			
Teacher (EEP)		44	49
Students (NASILP)		9	45

[1] Same questionnaire

To ensure the adequate representation of sufficient numbers of substantial programs, the target sample included a larger proportion of institutions classified as "PhD-granting" and "most competitive" than reflected in the 1990 MLA list of institutions offering Japanese, although, as shown in Table 1.6, the distribution of the sample by geographic region and institutional size is otherwise reflective of institutions offering Japanese in both the total NFLC sample and 1990 MLA list.

Table 1.6: Distribution of Responding Programs by Region, Size, Institution Type, and Selectivity

	1986 MLA[1]		1990 MLA[2]		NFLC Total Sample		NFLC Target Sample	
Region	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Northeast	79	23.4	86	20.9	46	22.5	10	22.2
South Atlantic	62	16.8	62	15.0	33	16.2	7	15.6
Midwest	86	21.5	97	23.5	49	24.0	10	22.2
South Central	12	3.3	20	4.9	8	3.9	4	8.9
Rocky Mountain	15	4.0	23	5.6	15	7.4	4	8.9
Pacific Coast	114	31.0	124	30.1	53	26.0	10	22.2
Total	368	100.0	412	100.0	204	100.0	45	100.0

Table 1.6: Distribution of Responding Programs by Region, Size, Institution Type, and Selectivity (continued)

Size	1990 MLA Data		Total NFLC Sample		Targeted NFLC Sample	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very Small (1,000 or fewer)	19	4.6	11	5.8	3	6.7
Small (1,001 - 2,000)	43	10.4	24	12.6	6	13.3
Medium (2,001 - 5,000)	78	18.9	32	16.6	4	8.9
Large (5,001 - 15,000)	148	35.9	59	30.9	13	28.9
Very Large (15,001 or more)	124	30.1	65	34.0	19	42.2
Total	412	100.0	191	100.0	45	100.0

Institution Type	1990 MLA Data		Total NFLC Sample		Targeted NFLC Sample	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
PhD Granting	126	30.6	63	32.8	22	48.9
Comprehensive	129	31.3	52	27.1	4	8.9
Baccalaureate	66	16.0	33	17.2	11	24.4
Two Year	91	22.1	41	22.9	5	11.1
Professional	N/A	22.1	3	1.6	3	6.7
Total	412	100.0	191	100.0	45	100.0

Selectivity[3]	1990 MLA Data		Total NFLC Sample		Targeted NFLC Sample	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Most Competitive	21	5.1	15	7.3	10	22.2
Highly Competitive	27	6.6	19	9.3	3	6.7
Very Competitive	75	18.2	34	16.6	10	22.2
Competitive	152	36.9	73	35.6	11	24.4
Less Competitive	30	7.3	10	4.9	1	2.2
Noncompetitive	15	3.6	8	3.9	3	6.7
Two Year Community College	91	22.1	33	16.1	5	11.1
Professional/Specialized	0	0.0	2	1.0	2	4.4
Not listed/unknown	1	0.2	9	4.4	0	4.4
Total	412	100.0	191	100.0	45	100.0

Sources: Modern Language Association, *Fall 1986 Survey of Foreign Language Registrations in US Institutions of Higher Education.*

[2] Modern Language Association, 1990 data.

[3] *Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, 1986.

Site Visits. At the postsecondary level, six institutions of different types were visited by members of the survey site visit team: a small eastern liberal arts college with a rapidly developing program, a large midwestern state university with a mature program, a large private university with diverse offerings in the study of the Japanese language, a small midwestern liberal arts college with a growing program, a southern state university, and a Pacific Coast two-year college with a large enrollment in Japanese language studies. As in the pre-collegiate survey, classes were observed and interviews were conducted with Japanese program administrators, teachers, and students to gain insights that could not be obtained through the use of questionnaires.

FALCON Alumni

To examine the relationship between language training, employment, and the use of Japanese beyond the formal education system, survey data were obtained from 100 alumni of Cornell University's full-year, intensive Japanese language program (FALCON)—approximately 60 percent of those who have completed the program during the past 17 years.

Japanese Language Training and Use in Business

Questionnaire data on language training and use were obtained from 17 companies doing business in Japan in order to examine the interest in Japanese language competence of U.S. companies. (See Table 1.7.)

Table 1.7: Business Respondents to the Japanese Survey (N=17)

Company Name	Field
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.	Medicine/Pharmaceutical
Campbell Soup Co.	Distribution
Dow Chemical Japan Ltd.	Chemicals
Dun and Bradstreet Corporation	Information Services
Grumman International, Inc.	Aerospace
Japanese Language Services	Translation
Mead Corp. (Coated Board Division)	Paper Products
Monsanto Co.	Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine
Motorola Inc.	Electronics
Owens-Illinois, Inc.	Packaging
Ralston-Purina International	Food
Sanwa Bank	Finance
Sea-Land Services	Transportation
Time-Warner, Inc.	Communications
UNISYS	Computers
United Airlines (Japan)	Transportation
Xerox Corporation	Electronics/Distribution

Japanese Language Training and Use in U.S. Government Agencies

Comprehensive questionnaires on Japanese language training and the use of staff with Japanese language competency were received from 7 federal agencies; interviews were also conducted at 10 agencies. (See Table 1.8.) A major government Japanese language program was also visited by a member of the survey site visit team with previous experience in examining government language programs. As at other site visits, classes were observed, and interviews were conducted with students, instructors, and program administrators.

Table 1.8: Government Survey Respondents (N=11)

Agency	Returned Questionnaire (N=7)	Interview (N=10)
Agriculture Department		X
Army, Department of		X
Commerce Department		X
Defense Language Institute	X	X
Federal Bureau of Investigation	X	X
National Institutes of Health	X	X
National Science Foundation	X	X
National Security Agency		X
State Department	X	X
Treasury Department	X	
United States Information Agency	X	X

Japanese Language Training in Proprietary Foreign Language Schools

Information on commercial Japanese language programs was obtained through questionnaires and telephone interviews from 34 private language schools from 23 cities. (See Table 1.9.) Additional information on language programs offered through 15 local Japan-American societies was also obtained.

Table 1.9: Proprietary Foreign Language School Survey Respondents (N=34)

School Name	Location	Questionnaire	Interview
Accent on Language	New York, NY		X
Academia Language	Honolulu, HI	X	
AISEI - Japanese Language Services	San Francisco, CA		X
Berlitz International, Inc.	New York, NY	X	
Boston School of Modern Languages	Boston, MA		X
Century School	San Jose, CA		X
CP Language Institute	New York, NY		X
Diplomatic Language Services	Arlington, VA	X	
Dynamic Language Center	Seattle, WA	X	
Foreign Language Center	Colorado Springs, CO	X	
InLingua	New York, NY	X	
InLingua	Washington, DC	X	
International Center for Language Studies	Washington, DC	X	
International College of Languages	Jacksonville, FL	X	
International Effectiveness	San Francisco, CA	X	
International Language Center	St. Louis, MO	X	
International Language School	Atlanta, GA	X	
International School of Languages	Los Angeles, CA		
Japan-America Interchange	Hartsdale, NY	X	
Japan Kumon Educational Institute	Torrance, CA		X
The Japanese-American Language Center	New York, NY		X
Japanese Language Center	Denver, CO	X	
Japanese Language Class	San Diego, CA		X
Language Enterprise	New York, NY	X	
The Language Exchange	Washington, DC	X	
Language Learning Enterprises	Washington, DC	X	
Language Plus	El Paso, TX	X	
The Language School, Inc.	Lexington, KY	X	
LinguAssist	Morristown, NJ	X	
Michel Thomas Language Center	New York, NY	X	
Modern Language Institute	New Orleans, LA		X
Peninsula Japanese Language School	San Mateo, CA	X	
U.S.-Japan Business and Recreation Corp.	Denver, CO		X
WTCP School of Languages	Portland, OR	X	

Endnotes

1. Participants in EEP (with headquarters in Ann Arbor, Michigan) receive nine weeks of full-time intensive training in the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language, following which they serve as Japanese language instructors at American and Canadian colleges and universities, while pursuing a Master's degree in the field of their choosing. In most cases, they inaugurate new Japanese language programs and serve as the only Japanese language instructor. The program is in its fourth year and has already trained almost 200 instructors.

FORMAL EDUCATION SYSTEM

TWO

Pre-Collegiate Instruction

The Pre-Collegiate Setting

In the past five years, the number of high schools offering Japanese language instruction has increased from approximately 200 to more than 770. The addition of elementary and junior high/middle school programs brings the total to more than 860 pre-collegiate Japanese language programs, in 46 states. (See Table 2.1 below.) There is no up-to-date exhaustive national inventory of Japanese language programs at the pre-collegiate level, in part because some states do not collect descriptive data on foreign language programs. Table 2.1 contains the best estimate possible of the number and geographic distribution of programs at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. These data are drawn from NFLC's mail and telephone inventories and a survey conducted by the Association of Teachers of Japanese.

Even this partial listing indicates that the Japanese language boom has clearly spread throughout the United States. Almost every state offers at least one program. The heaviest concentration of programs is, as one might expect, in the Pacific Coast states, within which 278 or 32.2 percent of the programs are located. In 1986, only about 13 percent of national public schools were located in these states.[1] Among the Pacific Coast states, the development of Japanese programs clearly varies. While California has 4.2 percent of the Japanese programs, it contains 8.4 percent of all public schools in the nation. Hawaii is proportionally overrepresented, with 6.4 percent of the nation's pre-collegiate Japanese language programs, but only 2.7 percent of the public schools—as are Washington with 12.4 percent of the Japanese programs, but only 2.1 percent of the public schools, and Oregon with 7.6 percent of the Japanese programs and 1.5 percent of the public schools. In contrast, there are obviously some states, notably in the South and Midwest, to which Japanese instruction has not spread.

One of the most remarkable indications of increasing demand is the development of courses in Japanese provided through distance learning networks to schools and student clientele, which do not have access to on-site instructional programs. This survey established precise locations for 288 such programs, scattered throughout 25 states, and served by the University of Alabama and the Satellite Educational Resources Consortium (SERC) based in Nebraska. There are at least 57 other schools in Arizona, Arkansas,

Kansas, Montana, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington that teach Japanese via Satellite Telecommunications Educational Programming (STEP) based in Washington. In addition, an unknown number of schools are served through the Texas Interactive Institutional Network (TI-IN) network based in Texas and other local distance learning networks nationwide. Because figures for many of these distance learning programs are unknown, precise totals are unavailable. Tables 2.2 and 2.3 indicate the 10 states leading in the number of high school Japanese programs, including and excluding, respectively, the schools served through the 288 distance learning programs ascertained by this survey.

Table 2.1: Pre-Collegiate Programs in Japanese, by State (Including SERC and Alabama Distance Learning Programs)

	Totals	E	M	HS	DL
Northeast					
Connecticut	5		1	4	
Delaware					
Maine	1			1	
Massachusetts	4			4	
New Hampshire	1			1	
New Jersey	20			20	(19)
New York	38	1	7	30	(1)
Pennsylvania	28			28	(23)
Rhode Island					
Vermont	2			2	
Subtotal	99	1	8	90	(43)
South Atlantic					
Alabama	13			13	(12)
District of Columbia	2			2	
Florida	10			10	(7)
Georgia	24	1		23	(17)
Kentucky	13			13	(10)
Maryland	23	10	1	12	
North Carolina	10			10	(3)
South Carolina	26			26	(25)
Tennessee	1			1	(1)
Virginia	22	3		19	(4)
West Virginia	16			16	(14)
Subtotal	160	14	1	145	(93)
Midwest					
Illinois	10	1		9	(1)
Indiana	50	2	6	42	
Iowa	23			23	(9)
Kansas	1			1	+
Michigan	22	2	1	19	(14)
Minnesota	6		1	5	
Missouri	14			14	
Nebraska	26			26	(25)
North Dakota	8			8	(5)
Ohio	39			39	(33)
South Dakota					(+)
Wisconsin	22		1	21	(12)
Subtotal	221	5	9	207	(99)

Table 2.1: Pre-Collegiate Programs in Japanese, by State (Including SERC and Alabama Distance Learning Programs) (continued)

	Totals	E	M	HS	DL
South Central					
Arkansas	15		1	14	(11+)
Louisiana	19		1	18	(17)
Mississippi	27			27	(12)
Oklahoma	1			1	
Texas	18			18	(11)
Subtotal	80	0	2	78	(51)
Rocky Mountain					
Arizona	4			4	(+)
Colorado	6			6	(1)
Idaho	1			1	
Montana	3			3	(+)
Nevada	1			1	
New Mexico	1			1	
Utah	10		1	9	
Wyoming					
Subtotal	26	0	1	25	(1)
Pacific Coast					
Alaska	14	3		11	
California	36		5	31	(1)
Hawaii	55		15	40	
Oregon	66	19	4	43	(+)
Washington*	107		9	101	(+)
Micronesia	3	1	1	1	
Subtotal	281	23	34	227	(1)
TOTALS	867	43	55	772	(288)

E = Elementary Schools
M = Middle/Junior High Schools
HS = High Schools
DL = Distance Learning Programs
( ) = Distance Learning Programs in High Schools
* * (Includes Three Junior-Senior High Schools)

Note: The symbol (+) is used to signify states receiving foreign language instruction via distance learning through STEP. Although 57 schools are served by STEP, the distribution of programs in these states is not known.

Source: Association of Teachers of Japanese, 1990, National Foreign Language Center, 1991 data

Table 2.2: States with Most High School Programs, Including 288 Distance Learning Programs (N=771)

States	Number	Percent of Total
Washington	101	13.1
Oregon	43	5.6
Indiana	42	5.4
Hawaii	40	5.2
Ohio	39	5.1
California	31	4.0
New York	30	3.9
Pennsylvania	28	3.6
Mississippi	27	3.5
South Carolina	26	3.4
Nebraska	26	3.4
Total	433	56.2

Note: States with no pre-collegiate Japanese programs: Delaware, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wyoming.
Source: Association of Teachers of Japanese, 1990, National Foreign Language Center, 1991 data.

Table 2.3: States with Most High School Programs, Excluding SERC/Alabama Distance Learning Programs (N=483)

States	Number	Percent of Total
Washington	101	20.9
Oregon	43	8.9
Indiana	42	8.7
Hawaii	40	8.3
California	30	6.2
New York	29	6.0
Mississippi	15	3.1
Virginia	15	3.1
Iowa	14	2.9
Missouri	14	2.9
Total	343	71.0

Note: States with no pre-collegiate Japanese programs: Delaware, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wyoming
Source: Association of Teachers of Japanese, 1990, National Foreign Language Center, 1991 data.

One other aspect of the spread of instruction in Japanese is evident in Table 2.1. Almost all (89.6 percent) of the regular programs are given at the high school level, and *all* of the tabulated distance learning programs are provided at this level.

It should be carefully noted, however, that in spite of the recent, rapid expansion in Japanese programs, less than 2 percent of the nation's schools provide instruction in Japanese, and less than 1 percent of students take it. A national discussion is badly needed concerning a satisfactory level of such instruction and the balance by grade level. It is unlikely that the current distribution by geography and level would emerge as the most desirable.

The survey instruments used here were returned by 39 principals. The principals serve in elementary, middle, and high schools that are overwhelmingly public, with the majority heading public high schools. (See Table 2.4.) The schools are equally urban and suburban, with a few rural schools represented as well.

Table 2.4: Distribution of Responses from Principals by School

Type of School	Number	Percent
Kindergarten, Elementary (K-6)	3	7.9
Middle School (7-8)	1	2.6
High School	30	78.9
Combined (K-12)	2	5.3
Combined (6-8)	2	5.3
Total	38	100.0
No Response = 1		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

Slightly more than one-half of these are magnet schools, with some kind of special focus: In five, the emphasis is international and, in four, language. Most are schools with a student population of 1,000 to 1,999; very few are larger than that, and none has a student body of less than 100. Only 23 percent are located in or near a Japanese community, but 62 percent have a sister-city relationship with a community in Japan. In 68 percent of these schools, the Japanese program functions independently without any kind of consortial agreement. In only three cases, students come from other schools to study Japanese, and four have teachers who also teach at other schools.

Program Structure

In view of the rapid expansion in the number of Japanese programs at the pre-collegiate level, how durable do they appear to be? Are they dependent on special external funding? What are the determinants of increases and decreases in their budgets? Do the principals view them as long-term or short-term programs? Funding for Japanese instruction comes largely from regular school funds—in 88 percent (29 in number) of these schools, entirely so—with only two schools described as being "very dependent" on external funds and four others "somewhat dependent." (See Table 2.5.) The external funding takes the form of special state grants and support from various business groups and foundations. One private school relies heavily on parental fees. Special cases are the intensive elementary programs, which require extra funding and occupy a unique place because of their unusual status.

Table 2.5: Level of Dependence on External Funding Among Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Programs

Level of Dependence	Number	Percent
Not dependent	29	82.9
Somewhat dependent	4	11.4
Very dependent	2	5.7
Total	35	100.0
No Response = 4		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

A key indicator of the degree to which a program is firmly embedded within a school's curriculum is the way in which changes in the level of its annual budget are determined. In general, adjustments in the local language budgets are made, when deemed appropriate, on the basis of enrollments and need. (See Table 2.6.) Overall constraints are judged to be the same for Japanese as for other language programs by a solid majority (87 percent) of the principals. One wonders if there is sufficient recognition of the fact that Japanese is unlike French or Spanish in terms of its requirements and expenses. Even one Japanese dictionary can cost as much as $60, and there is a crucial need for audio and videotapes and playback machines in programs in which instructors have limited Japanese competence. Teachers wishing to acquire necessary supplementary materials and equipment report encountering budgetary problems.

Table 2.6: Determination of Changes in Japanese Program Budget (N=39)

Determinants	Number[1]	Percent
Formula based on enrollments, etc.	20	51.3
Budget committee	8	20.5
Competition with other programs on basis of need	17	43.6
Other	9	23.1
[1]Multiple responses possible		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

How solidly established are these programs? A key indicator is the principals' judgment about the length of time a program is likely to be retained. In response to questions on this subject, almost all of the principals were certain their program would continue into the next year. (See Table 2.7.) However, when questioned about the likelihood of a program's continuation in three years, one-half of that group changed their prediction to no more than a likelihood of continuation. Although a majority continued to believe their programs were certain or at least likely to continue even five years later, the group claiming they could make no predictions at all about a time that far in the future increased to one-fifth of the principals who responded. Clearly, there is uncertainty regarding the permanence of Japanese programs, at least on the part of some principals, perhaps explaining the large number of teaching appointments that are on an annual basis. Japanese programs have a long way to go before they are considered as much a regular part of a high school's program as are French, German, and Spanish.

Table 2.7: Principals' Prediction of Continuation of Program

Prediction	Next Year		In 3 Years		In 5 Years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cannot Predict	1	2.6	1	2.6	8	20.5
Likely to be discontinued	1	2.6	1	2.6	1	2.6
Likely to be continued, but uncertain	1	2.6	15	38.5	12	30.8
Certain to be continued	31	79.5	15	38.5	13	33.3
No Response	5	12.8	7	17.9	5	12.8
Totals	39	100.0	39	100.0	39	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

Most important for the introduction of Japanese instruction, in the eyes of the principals, is the availability of a teacher, but it is not clear that "available teachers" are always sufficiently qualified, either in terms of competence in Japanese or pedagogical skills. Next most important is local school board interest, followed closely by student interest. Of significantly less importance are questions of external funding or state department of education involvement. (See Table 2.8.)

Table 2.8: Rank Importance[1] of Factors in Introduction and Continuation of Japanese Language Programs (N=39)

Factors	Introduction Mean Value	Continuation Mean Value
Teacher Availability	4.46	4.58
Student Interest	3.75	4.58
Local School Board/Administration Interest	3.81	3.53
Parent Interest	3.52	3.77
Support from Other Language Teachers	2.52	2.42
State Department of Education Encouragement	2.11	2.10
State Department of Education Directive	1.67	1.70
Support of Local Ethnic Community	1.80	1.52
External Funding	1.62	1.53

[1] Based on scale of 1-5 where 1 = "not important" and 5 = "very important"

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

The most significant factor for the continuation of Japanese language programs is teacher availability, and student interest is equally important, according to the principals. Parental interest edges out school board interest. There is little concern about external funding or state department of education encouragement or directives. It is worth noting that the support of the local ethnic community has minimal importance in either the establishment of a program or its continuation, a fact that distinguishes Japanese from many of the other less commonly taught languages.

Japanese for the Very Young

In a few elementary classes, Japanese has now been introduced both in regular part-time courses and in intensive programs that occupy most of the school day. Several of these programs were visited by members of the case study team and reported on in detail.

Children studying a foreign language at ages 5 to 9 or 10 are, in a sense, classroom acquirers rather than learners. Instruction is concentrated on modeling in the target language without the English explanation, which hastens control of structure in the case of older learners. The children are simply too young to handle a Category 4 language in grammatical terms: How could one explain the difference between the Japanese conditional and provisional or the use of the particle *wa* to a five-year old? Unlike the native speaker, acquisition for these children not only lacks the value of the crucially important preschool years; it is now further disadvantaged by being limited to time in the classroom, and it lacks the support of reinforcement at home and on the playground. Not to be overlooked is the fact that these children have already acquired another language through which the new target language/culture is constantly filtered.

In this expanding introduction of intensive programs in Japanese at the first grade level, it is not clear whether or not appropriate social behavior is receiving any attention. These young children, who are just beginning their formal schooling, are at the stage of development that stresses socialization within their native society. Are they expected to acquire Japanese behavioral patterns, thus ignoring their native social development? Or is it assumed that children as young as five or six are capable of developing contrastive behavioral sets—one their native home set and another foreign set being added at school? Or are these children expected, rather, to learn simply how to "speak English in Japanese," using Japanese as a linguistic translation of English with no attempt to alter their native American behavior? It is the last pattern that seemed most evident during the observers' visits, with the children receiving no guidance about the behavior the attendant Japanese language required.

Young children in Japanese programs have two clearly observable strengths: mimicking and comprehension ability. The fact that they are able to imitate so well argues for the advisability of having a native model. Children in one program taught by an American instructor with unusually poor pronunciation (almost unrecognizable as Japanese) were acquiring that poor pronunciation perfectly: For them, that *was* Japanese. Happily, those with native instructors were equally proficient at phonological imitation.

Ability to comprehend spoken Japanese was developing in most of the children at least regarding general understanding of the topics being discussed in the classroom. It was not clear the extent to which they controlled more subtle distinctions in meaning, however. Differences in aptitude were also beginning to emerge, a problem that had not been anticipated in at least one of the intensive programs. Concerned parents and a concerned teacher were wondering how to proceed: Was there any help for such children? Should they, in fact, be devoting most of their elementary education to a language that presented enormous difficulties? The native Japanese teacher had received no training nor was she experienced in meeting a challenge of this nature.

Even in an intensive program, observed in the course of a case study, speaking was definitely a serious problem for the children. The notion of using Japanese for purposes of communication had not yet developed. Thus, although they were able to participate in textbook Japanese on the basis of the teacher's model, they automatically switched to English when asking to be excused to go to the bathroom, get a drink of water, and so forth. Communicative replies to the teachers' communicative questions in Japanese were also answered in English. And on the playground, the children spoke to each other in English. Correction by the teachers of textbook-related discussion concentrated on content and ignored language-related errors.

It is not clear whether the young children in these programs had any clear understanding of what it means for a language to be "foreign." When the observers tried to use them as informal "interpreters," they seemed unable to conceive of a native Japanese who did not know English.

Reading was being introduced along with spoken Japanese, with the children showing interest in the strange (to them) symbols. The locating of appropriate reading materials was of course a problem for the teachers, which several teachers solved by creating the material themselves. In one class, the *kanji* for numbers were being taught through mathematical tables, even though the Japanese regularly use Arabic numbers in such contexts.

The observers were constantly reminded of the influence of the acquired culture of the native teachers on the classroom. Even in the context of an intensive program for young children that aims for a high level of proficiency approaching bilingualism, constant allowances were made for the fact that these pupils were foreign. The end result was a tendency to ignore authenticity in the presentation of the language. One example was the use of *kanji* in mathematical examples. Another was the singing of an American song with Japanese words, with serious distortion of Japanese syllabification. Particularly serious was the willingness on the part of the teachers to accept English answers to their Japanese questions and to answer questions put to them in English, to say nothing of their acceptance of non-Japanese behavior.

The haste with which some of these programs were instituted meant that a detailed curriculum with accompanying instructional materials had not been prepared in advance. As a result, teachers who engaged in extremely demanding instruction for many hours per day were also required to keep ahead of the class in terms of curriculum and materials development, a task for which they were ill-prepared. It is not surprising that at least one teacher of an intensive program has already resigned, reportedly being totally "burned out."

Programs involving the teaching of a Category 4 language to preadolescent pupils are experimental. The surprising fact is that there appears to be neither communication among them nor regular observation of these programs by specialists nor any related research in progress. Have the intensive Japanese program administrators been in touch with both the critics and supporters of the Canadian programs to learn from their experience? Have graduate students in sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics been invited to collect and analyze data on these programs? Are no studies in progress that will compare the developing and terminal proficiency of children beginning Japanese at age

5 or 6 with those starting at age 11 or 12 (claimed by some to be the most suitable time for embarking on foreign language study)? Specifically, at issue is whether or not equally high proficiency can be achieved in significantly less time if training is begun at an age when the pupils have developed greater cognitive skills. Another issue that must be addressed relates to the maintenance of motivation among students in the intensive track whose specialization in Japanese was a parental decision, made at a time when they were too young to make such decisions themselves: What happens if interest in Japanese fades at age 10? With each passing day, the opportunity to collect invaluable data is being lost, and this could affect the entire organization of future Japanese training.

Pre-Collegiate Teachers

It is the teachers who are at the center of every regular foreign language class.[2] It is the teachers who determine curriculum, draw up schedules, decide on classroom procedures, choose—and adapt, if necessary—appropriate materials, set the pace of instruction, and succeed—or fail— to motivate students to apply themselves earnestly to the study of Japanese. It is the good teachers who anticipate and handle with skill the particular difficulties that are regularly encountered by American learners of Japanese. And it is the good teachers who understand the goals of their American students in studying Japanese and work enthusiastically toward the achievement of those goals. The work is labor-intensive, and it is not unreasonable to suggest that only those who truly enjoy teaching Japanese are successful in all its many components.

It is assumed, of course, that these teachers have sufficient knowledge of the language they are teaching. Without that, even the best of pedagogical skills are without meaning—or worse: It is possible to imagine a particularly talented teacher transferring non-Japanese to a class of highly motivated learners with impressive ability!

The selection and training of teachers for pre-collegiate programs in Japanese present major problems. Indeed, there are some issues concerning teacher qualifications that remain unresolved. Teacher recruitment is a major problem for programs for the very young. Who are the ideal instructors for such programs? Native Japanese teachers who have taught children of this age in Japan are potentially perfect models of the target language/culture, but without specialized training, they cannot be expected to know how to handle Japanese-as-a-foreign-language. The eagerness with which such teachers raised questions and discussed problems with the visiting observers was a clear indication of this problem. American teachers, conversely, may know more about handling American pupils, but again, the question of their adequacy in Japanese becomes a problem. This was particularly evident in several of the part-time programs; in at least one program, the instructor's Japanese was shockingly inadequate and inaccurate.

Who Are They?

There are those who believe that most pre-collegiate Japanese language classes are taught by native Japanese. Actually, according to the data provided by this sample of 140 teachers, only 38.6 percent are native speakers. (See Table 2.9.) The vast majority of these teachers have been in the United States for six or more years. This suggests a native-speaker group acculturated to life in the United States, at least at the surface level. (See Table 2.10.)

Table 2.9: Native Language of Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Teachers

Language	Number	Percent
Native Speakers of Japanese	54	38.6
Speakers of Other Languages		
English	83	59.3
Other	2	1.4
No Response	1	0.7
Total	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Table 2.10: Length of Residence in the United States of Pre-Collegiate Native Speaker Teachers

Total Time	Number	Percent
Less than 2 Years	2	3.7
2-5 Years	5	9.3
6 Years or More	47	87.0
Total	54	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

As is the case with the pre-collegiate foreign language field generally, which covers all foreign languages taught in the United States, women teachers of Japanese exceed men by almost a three to one margin (74.1 percent female, 25.9 percent male among Japanese-language teachers compared with 75 percent female and 25 percent male for K-12 language teachers nationally). Rarest of all in the pre-collegiate setting is the native Japanese teacher who is male. (See Table 2.11.)

Table 2.11: Gender of Pre-Collegiate Japanese Teachers by Native Language

Gender	Native Speakers of Japanese		Speakers of Other Languages		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	5	9.3	31	36.5	36	25.9
Female	49	90.7	54	63.5	103	74.1
Totals	54	100.0	85	100.0	139	100.0
No Response = 1						

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Although most of the teachers are full-time appointees, almost one-half are on nonpermanent, annual appointments, a significantly greater number than those who enjoy permanent status. (See Table 2.12.) This situation highlights the newness of so many of the Japanese programs and the tentativeness of these programs, which are frequently not considered to be a permanent part of the curriculum at this time by a significant number of administrators surveyed.

Table 2.12: Employment Status of Teachers of Japanese

Employment Status	Number	Status
Permanent Employees	43	30.7
Multiyear Contract, Full-Time	11	7.9
Annual Contract, Full-Time	60	42.9
Annual Contract, Part-Time	24	17.1
Other	2	1.4
Total	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Most of the teachers in the sample are certified to teach in the American public school system. This is not to be identified with certification as a teacher of Japanese, claimed by slightly less than one-half of the sample. (See Table 2.13.)

Table 2.13: Pre-Collegiate Certification of Teachers (N=140)

Field of Certification	Number[1]	Percent
No Certification	13	9.3
Japanese	68	48.6
Languages Other than Japanese	45	32.1
English as a Second Language/Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages	10	7.1
Social Studies	24	17.1
Other	41	29.3

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Because few states have as yet defined the requirements or established qualifying examinations for certification as a teacher of Japanese, it is possible that some non-American teachers assume certification without understanding the exact meaning of the term. In American high schools, individuals who are "certified" teachers—that is, originally certified on the basis of one (or more) particular subject(s)—are apt to teach a number of subjects in which they may have widely differing degrees of expertise. Among the teachers of Japanese in this sample, there are those who also teach other foreign languages (Chinese, French, German, Spanish), as well as English, math, science, and social studies, for example. (See Table 2.14.)

Table 2.14: Other Subjects Taught by Pre-Collegiate Teachers of Japanese (N=140)

	Currently Teaching		Have Taught	
Subject	**Number[1]**	**Percent**	**Number[1]**	**Percent**
Other Languages	60	42.9	15	10.7
English as a Second Language/Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages	4	2.9	28	20.0
English	10	7.1	39	27.9
Social Studies	13	9.3	24	17.1
Math	3	2.1	15	10.7
Science	1	0.7	5	3.6
Elementary Education	2	1.4	10	7.1
Other	9	6.4	18	12.9

[1]Multiple answers are possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Site visits and interviews with pre-collegiate teachers more generally indicate that certification continues to be a major problem. Frequently, one finds requirements for certification of Japanese teachers that have been drawn up on the basis of those established for Category 1 and 2 languages. Although two or three years of three-hour-per-week part-time study of French or Spanish may be sufficient for a teacher to serve as an instructor in those languages, this limited amount of study of Japanese brings a prospective teacher to a level of proficiency far below what should be required for serving as a teacher of the language. Yet another concern is the failure of courses in schools of education to address the particular problems of teaching Japanese. Where does one find a treatment of methods for teaching reading of a language like Japanese with its totally different writing system? Prospective teachers who are native Japanese find the courses they are required to take particularly bothersome: Not only are they usually of limited relevance for teaching Japanese, they also present English-based difficulties that stem from the use of a special jargon. And then there are the states in which certification in Japanese has not yet been established.

Teachers' Background

The teachers in this sample represent a variety of educational backgrounds: Almost one-half majored in education and fewer than half that number in Japanese language, linguistics, or literature. (See Table 2.15.) Only slightly more than one-third of the sample group has ever taken a course on the structure of Japanese language. Virtually the entire group holds at least a bachelor's degree, with almost one-half holding a master's degree as well. Only 3 of the 140 respondents hold PhDs. (See Table 2.16.)

Table 2.15: College Majors of Pre-Collegiate Teachers (N=140)

Subject	Major[1]		Minor	
	Number[2]	Percent	Number[2]	Percent
Education	59	42.1	21	15.0
Japanese (language, literature and/or linguistics)	21	15.0	29	20.7
Other	71	50.7	0	0.0

[1] May include graduate and undergraduate majors and undergraduate joint majors
[2] Multiple answers are possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Table 2.16: Highest Degree Completed by Pre-Collegiate Teachers

Highest Level	Number	Percent
Junior College	6	4.3
Bachelor's degree	60	42.9
Master's degree	65	46.4
Doctorate	3	2.1
No Response	6	4.3
Total	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Nonnative Speakers

Of the nonnative speakers (85 in number), a significant percentage (60 percent) have lived in Japan for at least one year (see Table 2.17). Most (84.2 percent) report they are currently studying the language to maintain their proficiency, if not improve it. In spite of its critical importance, particularly for those teachers with low levels of competence, not all of the teachers receive financial assistance for such study.

Table 2.17: Length of Residence in Japan of Nonnative Speaker Teachers

Total Time	Number	Percent
Never Lived in Japan	15	17.6
3 Months or Less	12	14.1
4-11 Months	7	8.2
1-2 Years	16	18.8
More than 2 Years	35	41.2
Total	85	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

An examination of the amount of formal training in Japanese completed by the nonnative teachers gives cause for concern. There are actually individuals serving as instructors of the Japanese language who have studied no more than 10 weeks, and almost three-quarters (73 percent) of the nonnative teachers—even those who are certified—have had 3 years or less of formal instruction. (See Table 2.18.) This indicates a gross misunderstanding on the part of those responsible for certification standards and for program staffing of the requirements for teaching a Category 4 language. Learning any foreign language, which entails gaining a skill along with cognitive knowledge, differs from the simple learning of facts. Teachers who have studied only a limited amount of Japanese over a short period of time are not yet competent *even in that material.* Observations of site visit team members confirm that not only the delivery of Japanese—that is, pronunciation, intonation, fluency, accompanying gestures, etc.—but even the structure of non-native instructors' Japanese was, in many cases, far from accurate. There is also the issue of whether these instructors really know how their utterances are actually used—if ever—within this truly foreign Category 4 language and culture.

Table 2.18: Formal Study of Japanese by Pre-Collegiate Teachers who are Nonnative Speakers

Number of Years	Number	Percent
0	2	3.8
1	8	15.4
2	13	25.0
3	15	28.8
4 or More	14	26.9
Total	52	100.0
No Response = 33 Mean number of years = 3.442		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

In fact, it is doubtful that teachers with such limited training have any acquaintance at all with Japanese acquired culture, which has such a strong influence on the language. An understanding of this sort is not about the branch of culture that informs individuals they must take off their shoes when entering a Japanese home, rather, acquired culture refers to understanding concepts of in-group/out-group and hierarchy, for example, and the way those concepts affect language use. Asking math teachers—or even French teachers—to take on Japanese is very different from asking them to take on a new social science course. Until instructors have gained an overall understanding of this noncognate language and its noncognate cultural setting, and are able to understand how small chunks of language fit into the big picture, their piecemeal handling of teaching materials is seriously flawed. The consequences are grave: Not only have the students of minimally trained teachers not gained an advantage; in many instances, they require remedial training before making a new start. It is this type of faulty instruction that causes so many college instructors of Japanese to prefer true beginners in their elementary college classes to those students who have studied in high school under teachers with low levels of competence or insufficient understanding of effective pedagogy.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that these nonnative teachers are often extremely effective in conducting their classes. One of our observers reported on a class in which the instructor had been replaced three times within a single semester. It was the American with very limited Japanese who, from the students' point of view, was most successful, being fully "in sync" with their style of learning. A pedagogical dilemma emerges from this situation. It may be the American teacher who knows too little about *what* to teach in the Japanese language classroom who actually knows best *how* to relate to American students; the native Japanese, who is in total control of the *what*, may have serious problems with the *how*. Obviously what is required is a cadre of American pedagogues with sufficient knowledge of Japanese and native Japanese teachers who are well trained in pedagogical skills that are effective in teaching Americans.

When a comparison is made of the amount of formal training undertaken by the nonnative high school teachers and a self-appraisal of their level of competence, the depth of the problem of competence becomes even more apparent. (See Table 2.19.) With "1" representing "no usable skill" and "7" representing "ability equal to that of a native speaker," five intermediate levels were established, ranging from the survival level to a level that represents the ability to "use the language occupationally and socially at the *near native* level." The native speaker level was included only for purposes of comparison: For anyone not raised and educated in Japan as a native speaker of the language, proficiency at that level, with all it implies in terms of phonology, structure, vocabulary, registers, pragmatics, and so forth, is simply out of reach.

Table 2.19: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Self-Evaluation of Japanese Language Skills (Nonnative Speakers)

Ability Level	Speaking		Listening		Reading		Writing	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-3 No Skill - Extremely Limited	19	22.4	18	21.2	29	34.1	26	30.9
4-5 Occupational/Social Use with Some/Serious Limitations	52	61.1	50	58.8	51	60.0	55	65.5
6-7 Near-Native - Equal to Native	14	16.5	17	20.0	5	5.9	3	3.6
Totals	85	100.0	85	100.0	85	100.0	84	100.0
Mean level	4.412		4.518		3.859		3.821	

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Nevertheless, some in the sample evaluated themselves at this level in Japanese. Was it on the basis of living in a bilingual household as a child and attending Japanese school at some point during their pre-collegiate years? Such individuals may perhaps be mistakenly identifying as native level competence an ability to "function" in Japanese, although they lack the depth and breadth of the true adult native speaker. They are usually seriously deficient in complex grammatical structures, vocabulary, control of stylistic levels, discourse structure, and pragmatics, to say nothing of the cultural matrix within which the language occurs.

The other levels are indeed achievable, however, and there exists a wealth of experience about the amount of training needed to reach each level. Of course, there is variation, depending on the quality and intensity of the training and the aptitude of the learner, but at least a minimum requirement can be set for each level. For example, "6" represents a proficiency level requiring years of formal study, perhaps including enrollment in a full-time intensive program at some point. For some individuals, level 6 can be almost as unattainable as the native speaker level, if the individual's aptitude for language learning is not sufficiently high. When teachers who have studied Japanese for only a few years in part-time courses rate their competence at this level, the question immediately arises as to whether they know what *near native* adult Japanese entails. Can these individuals, with only few errors, understand lectures and news broadcasts on Japanese television, read Japanese novels and newspaper editorials, give a formal lecture in Japanese on the American education system, telephone the Japanese immigration office and ask questions about visas, tell a Japanese child a story, or undertake other tasks at this level? Among the nonnative teachers who were willing to take the plunge and appraise their own ability in Japanese, one finds very poor correlation between the amount of study and expected level of proficiency, except for a few individual cases. The general trend reflects an unlikely divergence and frequent overrating of ability. The concern here is not so much the actual ratings as the failure to realize the level of competence required of the teacher.

An examination of the means by which nonnative teachers attained their Japanese language skills indicates tremendous variation. (See Table 2.20.) Formal study took place in Japan and in the United States, at the pre-collegiate, undergraduate, and graduate levels. Some teachers acquired Japanese in the home, from spouses or other family members. However, the two categories mentioned most frequently, following the categories of undergraduate study and formal summer study, were self-study and residence in Japan without formal study—both of which can vary in value from being extremely productive to actually interfering with meaningful progress, depending on the exact conditions under which they occurred. For example, foreigners attempting to acquire the Japanese language in a totally unstructured way in Japan simply by living in the country often receive lavish praise from the Japanese for their efforts, in spite of the serious errors they are apt to make as a result of linguistic interference from English. When this praise for their endeavors is misinterpreted as approval of their language abilities themselves, the inaccuracies become fixed, and, with sufficient practice, foreigners may develop the seemingly incurable condition known as "abominable fluency."

Table 2.20: Source of Japanese Language Skill for Nonnative Speakers (N=85)

How Japanese Skill Attained	Number[1]	Percent
Pre-collegiate Formal Study in the United States	12	14.1
Pre-collegiate Formal Study in Japan	8	9.4
Undergraduate Study	44	51.8
Graduate Japanese Language/Literature Major	5	5.9
Graduate Major Requiring Japanese Language	4	4.7
Graduate Language (not major, not required)	22	25.9
Nondegree Language Study in the United States	13	15.3
Nondegree Language Study in Japan	26	30.6
Academic-year Program in Japan	13	15.3
Formal Summer Language Study Program in the United States/Japan	33	38.8
Studied with a Tutor in the United States/Japan	20	23.5
Learned from Spouse Who is Native Speaker	8	9.4
Learned from Relative Who is Native Speaker	11	12.9
Residence in Japan (no formal study)	28	32.9
No Formal Study	1	1.2
Self-Study	30	35.3
Other	14	16.5

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Certification Standards

To create a new pool of Japanese language teachers quickly, a suggestion has been made—and is even being followed in some states—that certified teachers of other foreign languages take a limited number of courses in Japanese and become Japanese teachers. This is extremely worrisome to anyone with true expertise in Japanese pedagogy. The current absence of objective testing instruments for low levels of competence and the widespread lack of articulation between pre-collegiate and college Japanese training have resulted in extravagant claims being made for the success of this approach. A case study observer who attended several classes taught by teachers with this kind of background expressed deep concern, not about the pedagogical skills of the instructors or their enthusiasm, but about their skill in the language. Needless to say, students studying under such instructors will learn little of authentic Japanese language or behavior, regardless of their motivation or application. A far better alternative for high schools might be well-trained native speakers working together with American teachers familiar with the American high school learner. However, such native Japanese teachers rarely qualify for certification because they have not taken the education courses that are required, regardless of lack of relevance to the Japanese classroom. In the words of one Japanese teacher who enrolled in such courses, the specialized English used in the lectures and reading material made the material virtually incomprehensible. It is clear that certification is a problem urgently demanding prompt and intelligent attention.

Given the central importance of the teacher, teacher training is at the core of staffing problems, but even this is a controversial subject, particularly when it relates to the Japanese language field. The definition of training seems to differ from one program supervisor to the next. For some—particularly programs in Japan—the emphasis is on the language itself, with a prescriptive approach: What kind of Japanese should foreigners be taught to speak? What is standard "correct" Japanese? How *should* "we Japanese" talk even if we do not always (or ever) follow these patterns ourselves? Others believe that training programs should emphasize the pedagogical skills, specifically the best methods of teaching Japanese to native speakers of one particular foreign language—in this case, English. Serious, professional-level teacher training programs of meaningful length are extremely rare, although they are available to the individual searching them out. More frequently, so-called Japanese teachers' workshops are held. These meetings last only a few days, during which panels of speakers "show and tell" their various disparate classroom procedures. These sessions are not unlike a recent issue of a Japanese magazine devoted to the theme, *Anata mo nihongo ga osierareru* (You, too, can teach Japanese). Depending on the qualifications of the instructor(s), brief training sessions, of course, may serve a useful purpose, but they cannot be considered adequate, in-depth preparation for the prospective teacher of Japanese.

Slightly less than one-quarter of the teachers sampled indicated that they had *not* received formal training in teaching Japanese; the length and nature of the training of the other three-quarters was not disclosed. Only 16 percent admitted to no training in teaching a foreign language. The difference is probably explained to some extent by the number of teachers of other foreign languages now teaching Japanese, who received their training before embarking on Japanese.

The experience of the surveyed Japanese teachers extends over a tremendous range (from less than 1 year to 33 years), but it is important to remember that not all of this time was spent teaching Japanese. However, when a teacher indicated less than one year of teaching experience in the United States, it can be assumed that the subject taught was indeed Japanese. (See Table 2.21.) Given the high percentage of pre-collegiate Japanese language programs that are new (65.8 percent have offered Japanese for three years or less), clearly some are taught by instructors who are teaching in the United States for the first time, if not for the first time anywhere. (See Table 2.22.)

Table 2.21: Total Number of Years Pre-Collegiate Teachers Have Been Teaching in the United States at Various Levels (N=140)

	Teaching Time in the U.S.						
	Less than 1 year	1 year	2-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	20 years or more
Education Level	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]
Elementary School	0	5	4	6	0	2	1
Junior High/Middle School	3	13	8	3	5	1	1
High School	6	16	28	20	13	13	5
Adult Education Programs	0	9	8	5	1	2	0
Community/Junior College	0	9	5	0	0	0	0
College/University	2	6	13	2	2	0	0
Other	3	2	0	1	0	0	0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Table 2.22: Number of Years Japanese Courses Have Been Offered at Pre-Collegiate Institutions

Number of Years	Number	Percent
Less than 1	8	22.9
2-3	15	42.9
4-5	10	28.6
6 or More	2	5.8
Total	35	100.0
No Response = 4 Mean number of years = 2.971		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

Teachers and Their Teaching

Of great importance to anyone surveying pre-collegiate Japanese language instruction are the criteria used in hiring faculty. Principals and teachers were both questioned on hiring criteria used for Japanese language instructors. According to both the principal and teacher respondents, the criteria most frequently used are a general knowledge of the Japanese language, and training in teaching foreign languages. (See Table 2.23.) However, a significantly greater percentage of principals find Japanese competence important, and the principals also find training specifically in Japanese a major criterion. Unfortunately, there is no agreement about the adequate level of proficiency or training. In the case of the principals, who regularly make faculty hiring decisions, judgment in these areas is particularly questionable because the principals themselves rarely have competence in Japanese nor do they have colleagues to turn to for guidance.

Table 2.23: Principal Criteria for Hiring/Being Hired as a Japanese Language Instructor

	Teachers		Principals	
Criteria	No.[1]	Percent	No.[1]	Percent
Already on Staff (expected to enroll in Japanese language courses)	19	13.6	6	15.4
Already on Staff with Some Knowledge of Japanese	31	22.1	7	17.9
Length of Experience as Japanese Instructor	25	17.9	17	43.6
Native Speaker of Japanese	54	38.5	23	59.0
General Knowledge of the Japanese Language	70	50.0	29	74.4
Trained in Teaching Foreign Languages	56	40.0	27	69.2
Trained in Teaching the Japanese Language	41	29.3	29	74.3
Other	34	24.3	5	12.8
Total	N=140		N=39	

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' and Principals' Surveys

In the opinion of both groups, native speaker status is comparatively important as a criterion for being hired, but of minimal significance is the fact that a prospective teacher was already on the staff. Because many of the teachers of Japanese had been teaching other subjects, for which they received certification, such status surely must have played a part, even if not the principal one.

Although certification is often cited by the principals as a factor making it difficult to hire qualified applicants, most of the teachers of Japanese *are* certified to teach in high schools—a fact that further suggests that those already on the school staff did at least have an advantage in the hiring practice. (See Table 2.24.) This was supported by the comments of several principals, added voluntarily at the end of their questionnaires: To inaugurate a program, "survey what staff can teach a less commonly taught language" and "encourage faculty to receive further training." The experience at one school was described in this way: "The Japanese teacher was already a 'popular' social science teacher with immense influence with students and community when Japanese language and culture was introduced. We tried to offer Chinese with an unknown teacher and there was no interest. I feel we benefited from having a good teacher who was known to teach Japanese."

Table 2.24: Percentage of Faculty Certified to Teach in High School

Percentage of Faculty	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
Less than 25%	4	10.3
26 - 50%	2	5.2
51 - 75%	4	10.3
76 - 99%	3	7.7
100%	24	61.5
No Response	2	5.1
Total	39	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

There were, to be sure, principals who, like many of the general public, felt that the ideal teacher was necessarily a native speaker, a view supported by a middle school principal interviewed in the course of one of the case study visits. Although there was mention of the value of such teachers' being acculturated to life in the United States, there seemed to be little concern about their pedagogical training—that is, the way they would teach a language they had never consciously *learned.* Not only did this principal make no mention of the need for training, she also raised no question as to the ability of untrained teachers—native or nonnative—to develop a curriculum for Japanese and write materials independently.

This school had actually hired a nonnative teacher, who was reportedly doing well in spite of her failure to qualify as a native speaker. The teacher herself was an articulate supporter of nonnatives as instructors on the grounds that only nonnatives know what it is like to learn Japanese as a foreign language. This particular teacher, newly hired, is still on probationary status. The principal can then change the teacher's status to a permanent appointment after several more years of experience, although the principal has no knowledge of Japanese or pedagogical principles related to Japanese. In other words, the decision will be made on the basis of the teacher's control of the class, the students' involvement in their work, and other matters unrelated to the language, with limited concern for the appropriateness of the curriculum as a Japanese language curriculum, the quality of the materials, or the students' actual performance in Japanese. It is the principals, of course, who always make decisions relating to their faculty, but in the case of a language like Japanese, some attempt to ascertain the exact degree of language competence the students are actually gaining should perhaps be made, with the help of outside consultation.

In discussions with principals during case study visits and in comments volunteered by principals on their questionnaires, there were frequent references to "language and culture" and "culture components" in the language classes. It is clear from their amplification of the term "culture" that only the varieties of culture that are consciously learned are implied. Visits to museums, sushi-making, origami, and other cultural activities were all conducted in English and in no way improved competence in the Japanese language, beyond introducing a few isolated vocabulary items like *sushi* and *origami*. Nowhere was there any indication of awareness of the concept of acquired culture—the variety that relates to behavior and interpersonal relationships—to say nothing of its crucial importance in the study of a Category 4 language like Japanese. It is this variety that indeed "cannot be separated from a good language program." The teaching of learned culture is of the utmost importance *in addition to* language instruction, but not only *can* it be separated, it *should* be treated separately until it can be handled in Japanese. Yet acquired culture determines the way an individual speaks.

Need for Outcome Measures and Standards

The problems of the linguistic and cultural competence of a teacher aside, what significance is actually assigned to methodological skills specifically related to Japanese? As long as applicants are permitted to become teachers without any certification of proficiency in the language, or lacking the knowledge of the best means for teaching a Category 4 language within its acquired culture, the results of pre-collegiate training will be mixed: Far from regularly providing an early advantage, this training can actually be misleading and counterproductive. This is not to suggest that there are not excellent pre-collegiate programs taught by highly qualified teachers. The problem is the chaotic lack of generalized standards that could prevent the continuation of nonproductive programs in their current state. The skilled teachers are often not aware of how bad conditions can be elsewhere, and the unqualified instructors, unfortunately, have no standards against which to judge their own performance.

There is strong agreement among the Japanese teachers in this sample that they spend more time on preparation for class than teachers of other languages. Although the average preparation time for high school Japanese is about one hour of preparation per day (see Table 2.25), the extremes vary dramatically: The range extends from five minutes to four hours daily!

Table 2.25: Mean Class Preparation Time for Pre-Collegiate Teachers of Japanese

Course Level	Number Responding	Mean Class Preparation Time (Minutes per Day)
Elementary School	6	37.5
Junior High/Middle School	13	103.1
1st Year	102	74.2
2nd Year	81	66.6
3rd Year	52	62.6
4th Year	28	58.9
5th Year	7	35.7
Other	4	135.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Although a sizable number of the teachers surveyed feel that they also spend more nonteaching time on school-related tasks and have more preparations per day than other language teachers, the percentage is smaller than in the case of comparison of class preparation time. The large number needing long periods for preparation may reflect the fact that Japanese teachers are apt to have more class preparations per day. (See Table 2.26.)

Table 2.26: Pre-Collegiate Japanese Teachers' Work-load Compared to Other Language Teachers

Impression of Work Load	Preparation Time		Nonteaching Time		Number of Class Preparations	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than Other Language Teachers	7	5.0	8	5.7	14	10.0
Same as Other Language Teachers	20	14.3	28	20.0	30	21.4
More than Other Language Teachers	81	57.9	46	32.9	60	42.9
Don't Know	23	16.4	28	20.0	14	10.0
No Response	9	6.4	30	21.4	22	15.7
Totals	140	100.0	140	100.0	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Given the tremendous variation among the Japanese instructors in terms of background and knowledge of the language, their teaching styles predictably reflect enormous differences as well. One area in which the variation is greatest is in the choice of orthographies. Although 13.6 percent never use romanization, a solid majority (62.9 percent) use it at the start of instruction, and Hepburn style is the variety most commonly used. The largest group within the sample (although not a majority) indicated that they introduce *kana* and *kanji* within the first semester. (See Table 2.27.) Following the regular procedure used in Japan in teaching native-speaking Japanese children, *hiragana* is introduced before *katakana* by most teachers (74.3 percent). One wonders if any consideration has been given to the use of a different order when the students are native speakers of English.

Table 2.27: Introduction of *Romaji*, *Kana*, and *Kanji* at the Pre-Collegiate Level

Timing of Introduction	*Romaji*		*Kana*		*Kanji*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Never	19	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
At the Beginning of Instruction	88	62.9	81	57.9	10	7.1
Within the First Semester (½ Year)	4	2.9	49	35.0	39	27.9
During the 2nd Semester	1	0.7	2	1.4	45	32.1
During the 2nd Year	0	0.0	1	0.7	34	24.3
Later than 2nd Year	1	0.7	0	0.0	2	1.4
No Response	27	19.2	7	5.0	10	7.1
Totals	140	100.0	140	100.0	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

In no area does the quixotic approach to pre-collegiate Japanese become so evident as in the introduction of Chinese characters (*kanji*). In first semester alone, the range is from 0 to 200, and the divergence continues through the fourth year. Within the first year, the range extends to 350. One thing is clear: It is impossible, during the introductory year of training, for high school students studying Japanese as just one of their many courses, to gain any meaningful control of an introductory level of the spoken language (which after all does have primacy over the written, for every language) and also cover the memorization of hundreds of *kanji* and their occurrence in context. The largest single group of teachers in this sample introduces only 50 *kanji* in the first year, but a number opt for as few as 10 or 20. Is there any accounting for such divergence? It is worth noting that it is the nonnative teachers who tend to teach slightly fewer *kanji* and the native Japanese instructors who are represented by numbers a bit higher. (See Table 2.28.) Those native speakers at the extreme of the range who teach the very high number of *kanji* reflect the native paradigm: Native speakers of a language, recalling their own experience in school, think of classroom study of their native language in terms of instruction in reading; their spoken competence, after all, had been acquired previously, outside of awareness. What is more, the burden of *kanji* memorization for those who are not fluent in the Japanese language is often difficult for native Japanese instructors to imagine, thus making appropriate pacing a tremendous challenge for them. Clearly this generally individualistic, poorly thought out approach to *kanji* and to reading is another indication of the need for organized curriculum development and guidance for the field.

Table 2.28: Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught at the Pre-Collegiate Level According to Teachers' Native Language (N=140)

Level of Study	Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught[1] by		Percent by Which Number of *Kanji* Taught by Native Speakers Exceeds That Taught by Nonnative Speakers
	Teachers Who Are Nonnative Speakers	Teachers Who Are Native Speakers of Japanese	
1st Semester	22	32	+46.2
1st Year	48	65	+37.5
2nd Year	117	133	+13.7
3rd Year	182	210	+15.5
4th Year	243	269	+10.8

[1] Mean number of kanji taught by the end of a given level

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

In any setting that includes instructors whose competence in the language, and/or training, and/or experience are extremely limited, teaching materials become particularly critical. Clearly the pre-collegiate teachers who were surveyed do not strongly support any materials that are now available. They have avoided adapting the many college texts on the market—an approach that would offer tremendous advantages from the point of view of needed articulation with college programs—and have given only limited support to the high school texts that have been published; only 27.9 percent of those surveyed use the Sato/Sakihara high school text for first year high school Japanese courses, and this represents the highest level of utilization. (See Table 2.29.)

Table 2.29: Texts Used at the Pre-Collegiate Level (N=140)

Text Name	1st Year		2nd Year	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Alfonso, *Japanese* (college)	1	0.7	3	2.1
Alfonso, *Japanese* (high school)	14	10.0	11	7.9
Gakken, *Japanese for Today*	5	3.5	2	1.4
Hibbett and Itasaka, *Modern Japanese*	1	0.7	1	0.7
Ito, *Nihongo*	2	1.4	1	0.7
Jorden, *Beginning Japanese*	5	3.6	6	4.3
Jorden, *Reading Japanese*	3	2.1	2	1.4
Jorden with Noda, *Japanese: The Spoken Language*	4	2.8	6	4.3
Jorden and Noda, *Japanese: The Written Language*	1	0.7	3	2.1
Kakutani, *Japanese for Today*	11	7.9	9	6.4
Mizutani, *Introduction to Modern Japanese*	1	0.7	4	2.8
Niwa, *First Course in Japanese*		0.0	1	0.7
Sato and Sakihara, *Japanese Now*	39	27.9	31	22.1
Young, *Learn Japanese*	15	10.7	24	17.1
Nihongo Shoho	8	5.7	10	7.1
Other	28	20.0	15	10.7
Self-Made Core Materials	31	22.1	23	16.8
Self-Made Supplemental Materials	41	29.3	32	22.9

[1] Multiple choices possible

Table 2.29: Texts Used at the Pre-Collegiate Level (N=140) (continued)

Text Name	3rd Year		4th Year	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Alfonso, *Japanese* (college)		0.0		0.0
Alfonso, *Japanese* (high school)	8	5.7	3	2.1
Gakken, *Japanese for Today*	1	0.7	2	1.4
Hibbett and Itasaka, *Modern Japanese*	1	0.7		0.0
Ito, *Nihongo*	1	0.7	1	0.7
Jorden, *Beginning Japanese*	3	2.1	2	1.4
Jorden, *Reading Japanese*	2	1.4	1	0.7
Jorden with Noda, *Japanese: The Spoken Language*	2	1.4	1	0.7
Jorden and Noda, *Japanese: The Written Language*	1	0.7	1	0.7
Kakutani, *Japanese for Today*	2	1.4		0.0
Mizutani, *Introduction to Modern Japanese*	2	1.4	1	0.7
Niwa, *First Course in Japanese*		0.0		0.0
Sato and Sakihara, *Japanese Now*	16	11.4	11	7.9
Young, *Learn Japanese*	16	11.4	11	7.9
Nihongo Shoho	8	5.7	4	2.8
Other	10	7.1	2	1.4
Self-Made Core Materials	15	10.7	8	5.7
Self-Made Supplemental Materials	23	16.4	10	7.1

[1] Multiple choices possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

When asked to list weaknesses in currently available materials, the responses offered by the teachers suggest that they have not surveyed all that is available with a view toward adaptation of the most appropriate for their own needs. They despair because no single text meets all their idiosyncratic requirements, from big print to hard covers, from illustrations to accompanying tape recordings, from more grammatical explanation to less grammatical explanation. In more general terms, the greatest percentage (40.0 percent) complain of a lack of appeal for the American high school student in the texts they have examined. (See Table 2.30.) Their solution has been to create materials of their own. The result is an inefficient cottage industry of ad hoc materials development, with the vast majority of those produced (77.3 percent), never being used anywhere except at the institution where they were initially created. This limited utilization is not surprising, given the expertise and time required to produce lasting, truly professional-level materials. Needless to say, these locally prepared lessons are not accompanied by professional-level video or audiotapes. Especially problematic are the structural explanations, insofar as they occur, a fact that accounts for the weakness in this area described by students who continue their study of Japanese in college.

Table 2.30: Ten Weaknesses in Current Japanese Texts Cited by Pre-Collegiate Teachers (N=140)

Weakness	Number[1]	Percent
Not Written for High School Level	56	40.0
Inadequate Exercises and Drills	29	20.7
Too Difficult for High School	27	19.3
Lack of Supplementary/Hands-on Materials	23	16.4
Not Enough Illustrations	21	15.0
Uses Romanization	12	8.6
Lack of Audiotapes	11	7.9
Grammar-Oriented	10	7.1
Lack of Practical Expressions	8	5.7
Repetition Poor	7	5.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

It is surprising—and distressing—to note the infrequency with which tapes, both audio and video, are used as an integral part of pre-collegiate Japanese programs. Slightly less than one-third of the teachers indicated that tapes were expected to be used regularly by their students. A limited budget may preclude the acquisition of a language laboratory in many pre-collegiate institutions, but in such cases, individual tape recorders, owned by a large percentage of American young people and their teachers, can be used imaginatively, to great advantage. A foreign language cannot be learned without accurate oral models, and nonnative instructors, particularly those with limited competence in the language, cannot satisfy this requirement. Tape recordings are an efficient way to provide such models. Given their limited use in current programs, it is not surprising that students are asking for more instruction in spoken Japanese.

Even the equipment that is owned by many of the high schools—that is, slide projectors, movie projectors, and computers—is used rarely or only occasionally, according to the teachers surveyed. Less than 6 percent of those with language laboratories in their schools use them often; fewer than 24 percent of those with audiotape recorders use them more than just occasionally. (See Table 2.31.) A picture emerges of classes being modeled on the most traditional of West European language courses, in which students concentrate on written exercises and workbooks, learning vocabulary and isolated sentences, but developing little in the way of oral comprehension or communicative skills. This was confirmed again and again by case study observers who tried unsuccessfully to engage students in the simplest Japanese conversation. One student described, with sadness, the experience of a classmate who had gone to Japan during a holiday break. Upon his return, the student reported that in Japan they did not say any of the things his class was learning. Another student commented on his/her survey form, "I think we should learn more about how to have a conversation with someone in Japanese. It's more useful than learning how to say 'star' and 'watermelon.'"

Table 2.31: Availability and Use of Instructional Resources at the Pre-Collegiate Level (N=140)

Resources	Resource Available		Number Responding	Frequency of Use of Available Resources			
				Rare/Occasional		Often	
	No.[1]	Percent		No.[1]	Percent	No.[1]	Percent
Language Laboratory for Class Use	35	25.0	35	33	94.3	2	5.7
Language Laboratory for Individual Use	24	17.1	24	18	75.0	6	25.0
Audiotape Recorder	111	79.3	102	78	76.5	24	23.5
Take-home Audiocasette Provided for Students	39	27.9	33	20	60.6	13	39.4
VCR/Video	131	93.6	113	76	67.3	37	32.7
Movie Projector	101	72.1	87	85	97.7	2	2.3
Slide Projector	110	78.6	93	87	93.6	6	6.5
Computers	68	48.6	60	46	76.7	14	23.3

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

In examining their students, the teachers use a number of different formats, including reading and writing tests, oral interviews, and checks on oral comprehension. Obviously, some instructors keep testing to a minimum, while others give daily quizzes in addition to less frequent, more comprehensive evaluation. About one-half of the teachers grade student performance daily. *Kanji* quizzes are the most popular and most traditional of all the types of testing being used—on average, these are used almost weekly (about 12 times per semester/half year)—while oral interviews (the only meaningful way to test speaking ability) and comprehensive exams are given least frequently.

Without knowing the exact contents of an exam and the manner in which it is administered, comparison of accomplishment across programs is, of course, impossible: Do *kanji* quizzes test recognition or production; *kanji* in isolation or in context? Are the language samples in oral comprehension tests isolated vocabulary or sentences or contextualized discourse; delivered at normal speed or at a deliberately slowed down tempo? Are comprehension items read several times or only once? Without a consistent level of difficulty and a consistent style of administration, any instructor can continue to claim that "all my students are doing very well."

The grading of the students as described by teachers shows as much variation as the other features that have been examined here. The percentage of those receiving "A" ranges from 2 percent to 90 percent, with about 24 percent of the teachers giving "A" to at least one-half of their students. For "B," the range is 5 percent to 98 percent, with at least one-half the students receiving "B" from 12 percent of the teachers. When there is a drop to "C," the range is 4 percent to 70 percent, with one-half the students receiving "C" from only 2 percent of the teachers. For "D," the change is predictably even more dramatic: The range of those receiving "D" is 1 percent to 39 percent, and as many as 80 percent of the teachers give a "D" to 10 percent or fewer of their students. Failing students are rare: Virtually all teachers give a failing grade to 10 percent or fewer of their students. In other words, there exists a gradually declining scale, in which most students receive "A" and the smallest number "F." (See Table 2.32.)

Table 2.32: Teacher Reports of Grades Received by Pre-Collegiate Students (N=140)

Grade Level	Mean Percentage of Students Receiving Grade
A	35.96
B	32.33
C	22.04
D	8.99
F	5.66

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Just as the comparison of entire grading systems across schools is impossible—after all, the most competitive secondary schools are more demanding and rigorous than many colleges—it cannot be assumed that the "A" given by one teacher at one school has any resemblance to the same grade from another source. Without any across-the-board evaluative instruments, no more can be stated than that most students pass their pre-collegiate Japanese courses with grades of "A" or "B," avoiding any attempt to interpret the significance of those grades in terms of actual accomplishment.

With only rare exceptions, pre-collegiate teachers of Japanese are able to decide independently what and how to teach, what textbook to use, and the general content of their Japanese classes. In other words, they set their own curriculum, regardless of their level of competence in Japanese, training, or experience. In the very few cases in which interference from outside was reported, it was most apt to come from someone with a background in Japanese studies, not necessarily language related.

The pre-collegiate teachers surveyed were asked to rate the level of support their Japanese language programs receive from various sources, on a scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 is "extremely unsupportive" and 5 is "extremely supportive." According to the respondents, all are experiencing widespread support for their Japanese programs, with few indications of unsupportive groups at work. The most enthusiastic backers are apparently their immediate supervisors and principals/headmasters. One can interpret this enthusiasm as a perception that Japanese language study is a prestige addition to a school's curriculum. The students themselves and their parents are also extremely supportive, as are nearly all school groups. (See Table 2.33.) Almost one-half of the teachers surveyed felt that there was more general support for the Japanese program than for other languages at their schools.

Table 2.33: Mean Level of Support for Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Programs (N=140)

Support Level	Mean Level of Support
Immediate Supervisor	4.169
Principal/Headmaster	4.107
Students	3.985
Parents	3.871
Language Laboratory Supervisor	3.818
Institution as a Whole	3.774
Other Language Faculty	3.678
School Board	3.676
Community at Large	3.574
Nonlanguage Faculty	3.500

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Mean scores, of course, do not describe extremes. Some of the few teachers whose programs are not strongly supported described their problems in detail on their questionnaires. Programs located in depressed geographic areas, where competition with Japan is viewed with antagonism, can be adversely affected by these general attitudes.

In 83 percent of the schools from which the principal's response was received, there is only one Japanese teacher, with the remainder having two. Even if enrollments are growing rapidly, few pre-collegiate schools are, as yet, able to take on more than a minimal staff level. While the average number of teachers of all foreign languages in these institutions is about six, most of the Japanese language teachers are operating independently, without any opportunity to benefit from daily interaction with colleagues who are also teaching Japanese. At most, they may be able to consult teachers of Japanese in the same district from time to time. For those who have had little or no training or experience and/or with limited competence in the language, the implications are serious. It is clear that these teachers are apt to feel isolated, even though more than 80 percent belong to some variety of language teachers' association. Nearly 16 percent of the teachers surveyed have been teaching in high school only one year or less, and more than one-third have been teaching for five years or less. Many are teaching in this capacity for the first time. (See Table 2.21.)

When asked about preferences for subjects to be given emphasis at future workshops, the topic most frequently cited by teachers of Japanese was "sharing materials and experience." Obviously, the teachers do not anticipate the same kind of rejection, for individual reasons, for shared ad hoc materials as they feel toward published materials to which they have been subjected. The need for teaching materials is further emphasized by the teachers' second most popular choice for emphasis at workshops: developing supplementary materials. (See Table 2.34.)

Table 2.34: Desired Emphasis in Workshops for Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Teachers (N=140)

Field	Mean Level of Desired Emphasis[1]
Sharing Materials and Experience	4.581
Developing Supplementary Materials	4.556
Teaching the Spoken Language	4.518
Teaching for Proficiency	4.359
Classroom Teaching Techniques	4.328
Program Development	3.877
Teaching Japanese Culture	3.875
Teaching the Written Language	3.818
Teaching for Accuracy/Authenticity	3.763
Using Instructional Videotapes	3.726
Managing a Japanese Program	3.664
Problems of American Students Learning Japanese	3.575
Using Instructional Audiotapes	3.541
Teaching Grammar	3.537
Pros/Cons of Different Texts	3.518
Using Textbooks	3.361
Other	4.667

[1] Based on a scale of 1 to 5 in which 1 = "Less Emphasis" and 5 = "More Emphasis"

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

The next most widely supported choice for inclusion in future workshops deals with instruction of the spoken language. (See Table 2.34.) It is the teacher who has attempted to transfer oral skills who realizes how great a pedagogical challenge this is—much greater than the teaching of reading. Written symbols are stationary and, thus, remain unchanged for extended and repeated examination. In contrast, a spoken sequence, with its subtle variations of meaning conveyed by intonation, phrasing, pauses, and the like, is gone forever, once it has been uttered (unless, of course, it was deliberately recorded). Countless arguments may ensue as to exactly what was said and what was meant. Native speakers attempting to teach their native language to foreigners are faced with the problem of handling, in a conscious and analytical way, something they acquired effortlessly and without awareness. For many who are thinking about their native language and how it "works" for the first time, adequate student-oriented explanations are impossible. Thus, the frequency of *kanji* tests, which are so precise and neat and easy to write, administer, and grade, in comparison with oral examinations, are not a surprising development.

The nonnative instructors' problems in teaching oral competence are very different from those of a native speaker. If they are functioning alone without the assistance of a native speaker, are they attempting to provide spoken models for their students? Is their modeling accurate? Has their own learning of Japanese included a sophisticated, learner-oriented analysis of the spoken language, or have they been trained by teachers who themselves were not consciously aware of the way the language is structured? Aside from awareness and knowledge, there is the further problem of pedagogy: How does one transfer this kind of knowledge as a skill, reflected in the way the students actually speak the target language? The learning of a linguistic *fact* is a minor accomplishment compared with its internalization, demonstrated by the *act* of using it. The language instructor who is attempting to teach oral skills is involved in both informational teaching (fact) and skill teaching (act), a combination that is extremely complex. The high priority given to learning more about teaching the spoken language suggests that many of the teachers, aware of their inadequate training and lack of expertise in this important area of foreign language pedagogy, may be avoiding it. Corroboration comes from the students themselves, many of whom are asking for more emphasis to be placed on the spoken language in their Japanese classes.

In spite of the interest shown in learning more about the teaching of the spoken language, few teachers in this survey are concerned with the use of audio and videotapes, an important adjunct of spoken language instruction. Also of less appeal as a topic for future workshops is a treatment of the pros and cons of currently available textbooks. Actually, this kind of study might well demonstrate the way some texts already on the market could be successfully adapted for more general pre-collegiate use.

The relegation of the teaching of grammar to a low interest category may explain the reason students continuing Japanese in college sometimes find they are behind in grammatical control. The stereotypical American student is assumed to have an aversion to grammar, but the teachers may be overlooking the fact that the Japanese language, because of its contrast with English, can in fact stimulate the interest of even pre-collegiate students when presented in a style appropriate to them; it can even increase enthusiasm for the study of English structure.

According to the principals surveyed, the class size in all foreign languages shows a marked drop in the movement from first to fourth year. Except for Russian, Chinese, and fourth-year Latin, Japanese has the smallest average enrollments. Again, the difference highlights the newness of many Japanese programs that, as yet, attract fewer participants than the long-established West European language programs. (See Table 2.35.) Although the surveyed group included one program that is nine years old, in point of fact, almost one-half of the Japanese programs examined are two years old or less.

Table 2.35: Average 1989-90 Class Size and Enrollments for Languages in Pre-Collegiate Institutions

Language	Number Responding	1st year		Number Responding	2nd Year	
		Mean	Sum		Mean	Sum
Japanese[1]	25	25.76	644	21	14.81	311
Chinese	9	12.56	113	9	5.89	53
French	26	55.54	1,444	25	55.80	1,395
German	17	34.82	592	17	27.94	475
Latin	13	34.54	449	13	27.46	357
Russian	9	8.56	77	9	10.22	92
Spanish	25	111.92	2,798	24	92.33	2,216

[1] Japanese data do not include 406 students enrolled at elementary and middle school levels.

Table 2.35: Average 1989-90 Class Size and Enrollments for Languages in Pre-Collegiate Institutions (continued)

Language	Number Responding	3rd Year		Number Responding	4th year	
		Mean	Sum		Mean	Sum
Japanese[1]	13	9.62	125	7	4.86	34
Chinese	8	3.50	28	6	2.67	16
French	23	36.26	834	22	24.59	541
German	18	15.33	276	16	9.31	149
Latin	12	10.33	124	10	3.20	32
Russian	8	6.38	51	7	3.86	27
Spanish	22	56.45	1,242	21	26.14	549

[1] Japanese data do not include 406 students enrolled at elementary and middle school levels.

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

In one middle school observed as a case study, the solution to overenrollment and scheduling problems in the first-year Japanese class was to put the excess beginners in the second-year class! Given the heavy skill component in language learning, this is not unlike starting the novice skier on the intermediate slopes or the beginner at the driving school with a spin on the turnpike. It may be possible to study the Civil War without having taken a course on the American Revolution, but it is most unproductive to try to start language training in the midst of a class that has been learning the language for a year. If one assumes that the principal who made this decision was surely aware of this, it would indicate that there was no expectation on her part that the first-year students had gained any significant level of skill that would put the beginners at a true disadvantage. Perhaps the course was assumed to be so involved in language games and "cultural activities" that the principal's solution for student placement was not as surprising as it at first seems. After all, Japanese is an elective at the school in question and comes under the heading of "enrichment." If the teacher is attempting to advance the students in the language meaningfully, however, and if the students themselves assume they are making recognizable progress in the language, a situation of this kind is seriously counterproductive.

A major concern in any language program is the rate of attrition in student enrollment between one level and the next: To what extent do students abandon their study of Japanese at each level of instruction? A study of 1989-1990 enrollment and program data provided by teacher respondents representing 113 high school Japanese programs shows a high rate of attrition from each level of instruction to the next. (See Table 2.36.) By the second year, the first year enrollment has been cut by almost one-half, and proceeding to third and fourth year, the cut approaches two-thirds more each year. However, only 35 of these schools offer a four-year program, and, among them, the rate of attrition is significantly lower. In other words, attrition is often the result of the absence of higher level courses at some schools.

Table 2.36: Enrollments and Attrition Rates for 113 High School Japanese Programs: 1989-90

	Total Enrollment	Attrition Rate	Number of Schools Offering Courses	Percentage of Schools Offering Courses	Enrollment in Schools with 4-year Programs	Attrition Rate
Level	Number	Percent			(N=35)	Percent
1st Year	4,082	100.0	113	100.0	1,420	100.0
2nd Year	2,334	42.8	95	84.0	987	30.5
3rd Year	890	61.9	70	62.0	543	45.0
4th Year	328	63.1	35	31.0	279	48.6
Total	7,634				3,229	

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Another reason for high attrition figures is the fact that so many schools are in a growth pattern. This means that, in any given year, the enrollments of classes at the second year and higher come from a previous year with smaller enrollments. Thus, as an example, in Table 2.36 the enrollment of 2,334 in the second year comes from the previous year's first year enrollment, which was undoubtedly less than the current year's 4,082.

Nevertheless, in absolute terms, the attrition rates for the 35 schools with four-year Japanese programs are still high. Schools must deal with enrollments that are very different in each successive year. As Table 2.36 indicates, a student body of 1,420 in the first year is matched by only 279 in fourth year. Supporting a four-year program becomes extremely expensive and difficult for principals.

Academically, these attrition rates are particularly serious in the case of a Category 4 language. The student who quits after one or two years of high school Japanese has barely begun. Even the three or four year high school student of Japanese has far to go before gaining any meaningful level of competence.

If, indeed, a substantial percentage of high school students of Japanese study for only one or two years, there may be reason to consider a curriculum that specifically accommodates those who will terminate early, as well as those who plan to continue Japanese. During third and fourth year, instruction aimed at those potential specialists should be the new focus.

Surprisingly, in the opinion of most of the principals surveyed, attrition rates are about the same for Japanese as for other languages taught at their schools. Of those few who indicated a difference, more felt that the Japanese rate of attrition is lower. (See Table 2.37.) However, the principals' own figures contradict these judgments. (See Table 2.38.) For French, German, Latin, and Spanish the rate of attrition in enrollments between first and second year ranges from 3.4 percent to 20.8 percent, according to the principals. For Russian, a language with less stable enrollments, the figures are most unusual: Higher enrollments are reported for second-year than for first-year, suggesting a decrease in interest among potential beginners. Only Chinese shows a huge drop between the two levels, comparable to that of Japanese. However, the total enrollments for Japanese and Chinese are very different: An enrollment of 644 in first-year Japanese is matched with 113 in Chinese in the schools represented, suggesting that, aside from the fact that Japanese enrollments have surpassed Chinese enrollments nationally, few pre-collegiate schools offer both languages.

It is significant that in all languages, students who continue their study for four years are comparatively few. However, overall higher enrollments in the West European languages make four-year programs more fiscally acceptable, and their status as Category 1 and 2 languages makes a two-year program more meaningful in terms of achievable competence.

Table 2.37: Principals' Estimate of the Drop-out Rate of Japanese Compared with Other Language Courses

	Lower	Same	Higher	Total Responses
Language	Number	Number	Number	
Chinese	3	6	0	9
French	9	14	6	29
German	5	14	3	22
Latin	3	9	1	13
Russian	2	5	0	7
Spanish	9	14	6	29

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

Table 2.38: Enrollment Data for Pre-Collegiate Language Courses in 20 Schools: 1989-1990[1]

			Attrition Rate
Language	1st Year	2nd Year	Percent
Chinese	113	53	53.1
French	1,444	1,395	3.4
German	592	475	19.8
Latin	449	357	20.5
Russian	77	92	+19.0
Spanish	2,798	2,216	20.8
Japanese	644	311	51.7

[1] Not all schools offer all languages and levels.

Table 2.38: Enrollment Data for Pre-Collegiate Language Courses in 20 Schools: 1989-1990[1] (continued)

Language	3rd Year	Attrition Rate	4th Year	Attrition Rate
		Percent		Percent
Chinese	28	47.2	16	42.9
French	834	40.2	541	35.1
German	276	41.9	149	46.0
Latin	124	65.3	32	74.2
Russian	51	44.6	27	47.1
Spanish	1,242	44.0	549	55.8
Japanese	125	59.8	34	72.8

[1] Not all schools offer all languages and levels.

Source: Pre-Collegiate Principals' Survey

Almost one-half of the teachers surveyed have no students who have come to their classes from other Japanese programs, and less than one-fourth of those who do have such students find that the shift has not caused any particular problems. One may safely assume that what problems do occur are caused by extreme differences in the rate of introduction of *kanji* or in the emphasis on oral skills.

In this period of the Japanese boom, recruitment of students is not a problem. At most schools, an adequate pool exists without any special recruitment efforts. Few teachers record any special requirements established for student enrollment in Japanese classes at their institutions. (See Table 2.39.)

Table 2.39: Requirements for Taking Japanese at the Pre-Collegiate Level (N=140)

Requirements	Number[1]	Percent
No Specific Requirements	103	73.6
Studied Other Foreign Language	9	6.4
Recommendation of Teacher/Language Department	10	7.1
Overall Grade Average	16	11.4
Grade Level	11	7.9
Other	10	7.1

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

The schools at which overall grade average, recommendations, and experience in studying other languages are prerequisites for acceptance are very few, totaling about 10 percent at most. Even if self-selection results in generally serious, well-qualified students, an open admission policy invariably leads to the inclusion of some who have only a casual interest in the subject of study and limited motivation for serious application. At least one of the students surveyed felt compelled to add his written comment on the problem: "I wanted to learn Japanese, but other people in the class wouldn't let me. They (50 percent of the class) held us back by not caring." A similar view was expressed by one of the observers who visited a high school class during which valuable class time was spent on futile attempts by the teacher to maintain class discipline. As the availability of Japanese courses becomes more and more routine and appealing to the average student, it can be assumed that self-selection will play a less important role, and the number of less serious students will increase.

It is surprising that so many students in this kind of open admission setting receive such high grades (as noted above) when the language is so difficult for English speakers. One explanation is the current self-selection by students. However, a valid question relates to the nature of the curriculum and the standards that are established. In contrast with those enrolled in Japanese programs about which they were extremely enthusiastic, a number of students volunteered to add to their survey instruments extremely critical comments related to the level of difficulty and the lack of challenge encountered in their Japanese courses: "We don't learn anything"; "Japanese was hardly a challenge....GET WITH THE PROGRAM"; "High school classes go at too slow of [sic] pace"; "We have been declining in study to the point where Japanese class [third year] is like a study hall now"; " We haven't been pushed enough"; "We rarely have homework"; "We need *some* homework"; "The work is too easy....I doubt very much that I would be able to learn Japanese language going at this slow pace"; "My Japanese teacher...does teach remarkably well Japanese for say 6th graders....Hey, I needed two study hall periods anyway." Such comments call to mind an experimental program in which a group of randomly selected high school students was well able to pursue an introductory-level college curriculum without any adjustment or simplification. There are also instances of high school students who enroll in college programs and encounter no difficulties. Thus, it would appear that at least some instructors are underestimating the ability of their high school students.

The results of oversimplification can be very different. The students of one program visited by a survey observer concluded that "Japanese is much easier than French." This surprising statement became clear as soon as the observer visited a class session and noted both the content and style of instruction, which presented a limited amount of artificially simplified language offering absolutely no challenge to the students.

There are many reasons why students terminate their study of Japanese prior to leaving school, according to the teachers. They assign as the main cause the difficulty of the language and, second in importance, poor grades and a lack of dedication on the part of the students. The other principal reasons are related: the amount of preparation time required and the difficulty of the writing system. All can be interpreted as connected with curriculum: How does one develop a course of study that is meaningful, challenging, exciting, relevant to student goals, and, at the same time, appropriately paced? (See Table 2.40.) One thing is clear: The reasons for dropping Japanese are undoubtedly related to extremes in teaching style, not the averages. The teachers themselves have indicated their grades are, on average, high, and their students are not faring very well in college. Are the current curricula really different? What are the real reasons for dropping?

Table 2.40: Reasons Given by Teachers for Students Ceasing to Study Japanese Prior to Leaving School (N=140)

Reasons	Number[1]	Percent
Poor Grades	60	42.9
Difficulty of the Language in General	73	52.2
Difficulty of the Writing System	51	36.4
Inadequate Teaching Materials	13	9.3
Lack of Interest	36	25.7
Lack of Dedication	60	42.8
Too Much Time Required to Prepare for Class	51	36.4
Too Much Time Required to Teach Useful Proficiency	37	26.4
Other	28	20.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

When the data relating to teachers' estimates of students' planned continuation of study are examined, one finds a surprising range of projections, which often shows little agreement with the actual attrition rate of previous years. For anticipated enrollment in the next level of instruction following the first year, estimates range from 0 percent to 100 percent of the current students; following the second year, estimates range from 10 percent to 100 percent; following the third year, from 2 to 100 percent, and following the fourth year, from 0 to 100 percent. It is surprising that 31 respondents, representing these four levels of high school instruction, predicted that *all* their students would continue into the next level. However, when the comparison is between mean scores and the actual attrition rates described above, deviation is particularly significant for the more advanced levels. (See Table 2.41.)

Table 2.41: Teachers' Estimates of Percentage of Students Expected to Continue Japanese for at Least 1 More Year

Level or Year	Mean Percentage	Number of Teachers
Elementary school	70.0	5
Junior high school	63.0	13
1st Year	73.9	101
2nd Year	64.8	81
3rd Year	63.5	49
4th Year	58.8	22

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

These data make it particularly important to remember that a mean score is an average of much greater extremes. Clearly, the expectations of individual teachers regarding student continuation show enormous differences.

The Japanese teachers surveyed expect their students to go to college; the mean percentage expected to matriculate is about 85 percent, with almost 62 percent of responding teachers predicting that at least 95 percent would attend. When the student respondents were asked if they planned to attend college, they replied in the affirmative almost without exception. The teachers' estimates as to whether their twelth grade students would continue studying Japanese in college showed some contrast with the students' own predictions: 25.8 percent of the teachers indicated that they did not know, whereas 34.9 percent of the students themselves admitted uncertainty; 32.6 percent of the teachers predicted that more than one-half of the students would continue, and 15.9 percent estimated that between one-quarter and one-half would go on, compared with 56.0 percent of the students who expressed definite plans for continuation. (See Tables 2.42 and 2.43.)

Table 2.42: Percentage of Twelfth-Grade Students Expected to Continue Studying Japanese in College

Percentage	Number	Percent
Do Not Know	34	25.8
Less Than 5%	12	9.1
6-10%	11	8.3
11-25%	11	8.3
26-50%	21	15.9
More than 50%	43	32.6
Total	132	100.0
No Response = 8		

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Table 2.43: Percentage of Pre-Collegiate Students Expecting to Continue Studying Japanese in College

Expect to Study Japanese?	Number	Percent
Do Not Know	398	34.9
Yes	640	56.0
No	104	9.1
Total	1,142	100.0
No Response = 43		

Source: High School Students' Survey

For the college teacher of Japanese, a serious issue with students who have studied Japanese in high school is the matter of articulation: When these former students of Japanese arrive at college and enroll in Japanese programs, how does their previous training articulate with established college programs? Should there be any expectation of articulation between the two levels of instruction? To what extent will high school training receive advanced placement credit at the college level? Generally speaking, the high school teachers showed little agreement regarding their expectations of articulation between their high school instruction and college courses. For example, 17.1 percent said they simply did not know the placement level decision for students who had completed two years of high school study, while 40.7 percent predicted they would enter second-year college courses, and 32.9 percent predicted that they would begin again in first-year courses. For students with four years of high school training, 20.7 percent could not predict placement and 32.1 percent thought that they, too, would begin with second-year college Japanese. Only 20.0 percent of teachers expected their students to enter at the third-year level or higher, and 4.3 percent actually thought even these students would go back to first-year Japanese. (See Table 2.44.)

Table 2.44: Teachers' Estimates of College Entry Level Course of High School Graduates

Placement Level	After 2 Years of Study		After 4 Years of Study	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Do Not Know	24	17.1	29	20.7
1st Year	46	32.9	6	4.3
2nd Year	57	40.7	45	32.1
3rd Year or Higher	2	1.4	28	20.0
No Response	11	7.9	32	22.9
Total	140	100.0	140	100.0

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

In other words, a significant number of high school teachers have little confidence that their instruction will lead to advanced placement in college, in spite of the fact that 51 percent or more of principals expect their students to be placed beyond the beginning level. Part of the difficulty, as discussed later, lies in the diversity of approaches and standards at the college level, as well as those that exist at the high school level. However, 56 percent or more of the principals indicated that there is actually no attempt to articulate with postsecondary level programs. In any event, these divergent attitudes cast serious doubt on the widespread belief that starting Japanese in pre-collegiate courses will definitely enable students to move to significantly higher levels of proficiency in college.

If indeed there is no interest in articulation on the part of high school staffs, have the students been so informed? Apparently not. In spite of the high attrition rates resulting in low enrollments in advanced high school Japanese courses, a very small percentage (9.0 percent) of the 1,185 high school students sampled believe they will not be placed higher than a first-year course when they begin Japanese at college. Of the remainder, more than twice as many believe they definitely will receive advanced placement as compared with those who are not certain—42.4 percent and 20.3 percent respectively. Although there are, of course, those who are pleased by their college placement, data from a sample of 96 former high school students now studying in colleges across the country contrast sharply with the high school students' general expectations. (See Table 2.45.) Of those who had completed only the first-year level in high school, 81.5 percent did indeed begin again at the first-year, first-semester level in college. Even after four years of high school Japanese, 57.9 percent returned to the first-year level in college—42.1 percent to first-semester, first-year and 15.8 percent to second-semester, first-year.

Table 2.45: Actual College Entry Course Placement of High School Alumni

		Level of First College Course												
High School Study Completed	Total Responses	1st sem.		2nd sem.		3rd sem.		4th sem. or Higher		Other		Not taken		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Total
1st Year	27	22	81.5	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	100.0
2nd Year	18	10	55.5	2	11.1	3	16.8	1	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6	100.0
3rd Year	24	13	54.1	8	33.3	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	4.2	100.0
4th Year	19	8	42.1	3	15.8	2	10.5	4	21.0	1	5.3	1	5.3	100.0
Other	4	2	50.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	100.0
Totals	92	55	59.8	16	17.4	7	7.6	7	7.6	3	3.3	4	4.3	100.0
No Response = 4														

Source: Pre-Collegiate Alumni Survey

Although a majority of the principals believe that actually no attempt is made to articulate the Japanese programs in their schools with college Japanese programs, nevertheless, approximately the same number—51.3 percent of the teacher sample, expect that their students will be placed beyond the beginning level if they continue Japanese in college. Surprisingly, this judgment was made without any differentiation of the amount of Japanese a student had completed in high school. There is the suggestion that communication between principals and Japanese teachers may be limited, because the latter are considerably less confident and less optimistic about advanced placement of their students in college programs. It also signals a lack of understanding on the part of many of these principals of the special problems posed by a language like Japanese and of the necessity for carefully thought-out articulation if high school students are indeed to be able to count on advanced placement when they reach college. Curriculum guidelines for French and Spanish do not serve as models for Japanese. There is a widespread lack of understanding of the training and language background required for developing an appropriate curriculum for Japanese and teaching it effectively. The result is a serious miscalculation regarding what is really being accomplished, a situation that has little chance of improving without the availability of objective testing instruments. In the words of one former Japanese high school student now in college, "I was amazed at how quickly students learn Japanese here. We covered so much material in just a few weeks, and the students really learned it." In addition to the serious pre-collegiate programs in which students learn useful amounts of the language, there are also many programs that concentrate on games, crossword puzzles, isolated *kanji*, and word lists, with no thought of teaching anything even vaguely resembling communication. The time, money, and effort expended on such programs produce no recognizable results in terms of true language competence.

Articulation, of course, should never be assumed to be a goal. There are those who believe that high school programs should continue as they are because of the nature of the American high school student—an undemanding introduction to Japanese that stimulates interest in the subject is all that should be expected. Unfortunately, the failure to define goals is leaving many students—and their parents—puzzled and even angry. The assumption that high school training moves students to "the fast track" proves true only in the case of those programs that have been truly challenging and demanding.

Insofar as articulation is advocated, it must never be regarded as a matter of colleges dictating curriculum to high schools. However, it *can* mean that the two types of instructors establish lines of communication for mutual benefit. Many high school teachers apparently do not know what happens to their graduates once they enter college. Do they investigate the different types of Japanese curricula offered in colleges and furnish guidance to their students, recognizing individual student goals? Are they becoming familiar with current testing procedures and terminology so that they may rank their students according to a standard that is meaningful beyond their classroom walls?

Unfortunately, many high school teachers are not following the experiences of their former students who have gone on to study Japanese in college. As many as 45 percent of the respondents in this study admitted they did not know what difficulties, if any, these students were encountering. (See Table 2.46.) Clearly, there is a serious lack of communication between high school and college Japanese programs and much misunderstanding among the teaching staffs about the focus of student interest. There are those high school students, of course, who will never be concerned with articulation—who feel that regardless of placement, their students have gained a useful introduction to the Japanese language.

Table 2.46: Teachers' Estimate of Problems Students Face in College-Level Japanese (N=140)

Problems	Number[1]	Percent
Do Not Know	63	45.0
No Problems	13	9.3
Increased Emphasis on Written Language	36	25.7
Increased Emphasis on Spoken Language	17	12.1
Placed Too High	3	2.1
Placed Too Low	12	8.6
Other	19	13.6

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

Predictably, the teachers' estimates of their students' final levels of proficiency at the conclusion of high school training in the four skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) once again show extreme variation. With "1" representing "no usable skill" and "7" representing "ability equal to that of a native speaker," five intermediate levels were established—from survival level to one that represents the ability to "use the language occupationally and socially at the *near native* level." The vast majority clustered around the level described as "survival," a reasonable prediction only for those completing with distinction a well-organized curriculum that included the regular use of audiotapes for developing speaking and listening proficiency. However, most students do *not* achieve this level as described by its accepted definition. Those who learn only how to say "watermelon" and "star" and the like—that is, isolated vocabulary and isolated sentences—would never pass a proficiency test at the "survival" level. The attempts made by members of the observation team to engage the high school students in any type of "survival" conversation met with dismal failure. "Survival" as currently defined implies communication, the feature lacking in the approach taken by many teachers.

Many of the survey respondents (about one-third of the teachers) estimate that the majority of their students reach the "beyond survival" level, is totally unrealistic in view of what was observed in actual classrooms and what is known about the amount of instruction these students have completed. A significant number of teachers gave even higher estimates to describe their students' which demonstrates a lack of understanding of the terminology "occupational and social use of the language." Although level 6 and level 7 were included on this scale, the respondents did not place any student in either the "near native" or "equivalent to native speaker" levels. (See Table 2.47.)

Table 2.47: Teachers' Evaluation of Pre-Collegiate Students' Japanese Language Skills upon Leaving Institution

	Speaking		**Listening**		**Reading**		**Writing**	
Ability Level	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**	**No.**	**%**
1 - No Usable Skill	4	2.9	6	4.3	12	8.6	12	8.6
2 - Survival Level	51	36.4	48	34.3	52	37.1	54	38.6
3 - Somewhat Beyond Survival, but Extremely Limited	43	30.7	44	31.4	40	28.6	41	29.2
4 - Occupational and Social Use, but with Serious Limitations	24	17.1	19	13.6	17	12.1	12	8.6
5 - Occupational and Social Use, with Only Some Limitations	7	5.0	10	7.1	6	4.3	7	5.0
No Response	11	7.9	13	9.3	13	9.3	14	10.0
Totals	140	100.0	140	100.0	140	100.0	140	100.0
Mean values[1]	2.837		2.835		2.630		2.587	

[1] Means were based on responses on a scale of 1-5

Source: Pre-Collegiate Teachers' Survey

High School Students

It is at the high school level that students in significant numbers elect to study Japanese themselves. Who then are these students, and why do they elect to study Japanese in these programs that have no restrictions for acceptance? Ethnically, the sample of 1,185 is preponderantly a Caucasian group, with some Asian-Americans (16 percent) and an almost total lack of African-Americans (2.1 percent) and Hispanics (1.3 percent). Males outnumber females by a very small margin. Although the majority have studied other foreign languages—mostly French, German, and Spanish with some Chinese, Latin, and Russian—more than one-third, surprisingly, have had no previous foreign language experience. (See Table 2.48.)

Table 2.48: Other Languages Studied by Pre-Collegiate Students (N=1,185)

Language	Number[1]	Percent
Chinese	41	3.5
French	261	22.0
German	156	13.2
Latin	55	4.6
Russian	29	2.4
Spanish	406	34.3
Other	89	7.5
None	433	36.5

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: High School Students' Survey

The evidence of self-selection for the study of a difficult language manifests itself with great clarity in the statistics dealing with interest in school and overall academic success: The students who elect to study Japanese tend to be enthusiastic about their schooling, interested in the study of foreign languages in general and in Japanese in particular, and high achievers in their high school courses. (See Tables 2.49 and 2.50.) What is more, 95 percent plan to attend college. However, it is safe to predict that if the *nihongo-buumu* develops to the point at which Japanese offerings become as common as those in Spanish and French, self-selection will disappear. This is already beginning to be reported in some areas of the United States.

Table 2.49: Self-Evaluation of Interest in School, Foreign Languages, and Japanese

	School		Foreign Languages		Learning Japanese	
Self-Evaluation	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
1 (Very Low)	42	3.5	44	3.7	39	3.3
2	81	6.8	67	5.7	43	3.6
3	333	28.1	247	20.8	171	14.4
4	478	40.3	402	33.9	374	31.6
5 (Very High)	224	18.9	387	32.7	531	44.8
No Response	27	2.3	38	3.2	27	2.3
Totals	1,185	100.0	1,185	100.0	1,185	100.0
Mean Interest	3.65		3.89		4.14	

Source: High School Students' Survey

Table 2.50: Self-Evaluation of Success in School, Foreign Languages, and Japanese

	School		Foreign Languages		Learning Japanese	
Self-Evaluation	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
1 (Very Low)	13	1.1	45	3.8	54	4.5
2	20	1.7	87	7.3	91	7.7
3	265	22.4	316	26.7	270	22.8
4	537	45.3	435	36.7	406	34.3
5 (Very High)	309	26.1	248	20.9	323	27.3
No Response	41	3.5	54	4.6	41	3.5
Totals	1,185	100.0	1,185	100.0	1,185	100
Mean Success	3.97		3.67		3.75	

Source: High School Students' Survey

In response to questions about the percentage of their high school seniors who enter college, a surprisingly large percentage of the principals surveyed gave no answer: 26 percent failed to respond when asked about their seniors in general, and 41 percent provided no answer when the question was limited to seniors enrolled in Japanese classes. However, an examination of the responses of principals who did answer the questions shows an interesting contrast: Whereas only 17 percent of the principals believed that all of their seniors would go on to college, 52 percent estimated that all of their seniors taking Japanese would matriculate. Furthermore, 41 percent thought that at least 80 percent of all seniors would enroll in college, while 65 percent gave the same estimate for their twelfth-grade Japanese students. This supports the answers of the Japanese students themselves, which showed them to be above average in achievement and interest in studies, the kind of students most apt to pursue postsecondary education. In other words, there does indeed seem to be a system of self-selection generally at work that brings the better students to the Japanese courses.

With an enrollment of well-motivated high achievers, is there justification for the assumption that their progress in high school must always be slower than in college, even during junior and senior years? The current rate of progress may, to some extent, be no more than the fulfillment of low expectations. A majority of the students sampled (60.9 percent) estimate their outside study time devoted to Japanese to be two hours or less per week, and 12.6 percent spend no time at all as a supplement to class time. What is particularly significant is the fact that for almost one-half of the student sample (40.4 percent), this time spent on Japanese represented less than 10 percent of the time devoted to homework. (See Table 2.51.) It would appear that this Category 4 language, far from challenging the capable students who have elected to study it, is being presented in a manner that assumes the possibility only of slow progress. Low achievement becomes the realization of low expectations on the part of the teacher. One wonders about teachers' explanation of student attrition in terms of the difficulty of Japanese and, among other things, the time required to prepare for class.

Table 2.51: Student Reported Homework for Japanese Class

Hours per Week Spent on Homework for Japanese Class		
Hours per week	**Number**	**Percent**
0	149	12.6
1-2	572	48.3
3-6	389	32.8
7 or More	51	4.3
No Response	24	2.0
Totals	1,185	100.0
Mean Hours: 2.48		
Japanese Homework as a Percentage of All Homework		
Percentage of Homework that is Japanese	**Number**	**Percent**
0 - 10%	479	40.4
11 - 25%	352	29.7
26 - 50%	170	14.3
More than 51%	44	3.7
No Response	140	11.8
Total	1,185	100.0
Mean Percent: 19.16		

Source: High School Students' Survey

The question then turns on what factors influenced these young people to embark on the study of a language and culture so markedly different from their own. (See Table 2.52.) When queried, various reasons were cited as having had some influence, with a significant number of votes going to items with a Japan base—interest in things Japanese, a desire to go to Japan, an awareness of the importance of Japan in the world today—and to one item with a very practical purpose—it would look good on one's record to have studied Japanese. The reason that emerged as the most significant instrumental motivation for the study of the language was to improve job opportunities. Ninety-five percent of the students plan to go to college, and Japanese has special value among this generation of high school students: They single out business as their clear first choice for specialization in the future, with science and technology a significantly less popular second choice. (See Table 2.53.)

Table 2.52: Reasons for Choosing to Study Japanese[1] (N=1,185)

Reasons	Selected[2]	Percent	Selected as Important	Percent
Job Opportunities	770	65.0	185	15.6
Interest in Japanese Culture	717	60.5	102	8.6
Want to Go to Japan	637	53.7	61	5.1
Importance of Japan in the World	601	50.7	73	6.2
Looks Good on Record	551	46.5	25	2.1
Interest in Languages/Linguistics	520	43.9	73	6.2
More Challenging than Other Languages	511	43.1	35	3.0
To Satisfy Language Requirement	409	34.5	16	1.4
Preparation for College Japanese	399	33.7	10	0.8
Family Pressure/Advice/Interest	249	21.0	17	1.0
Want to Promote World Peace	144	12.1	14	1.2
A Friend's Recommendation	154	13.0	7	0.6
Reputation of Japanese Teacher	120	10.1	7	0.6
Other Reasons	152	12.8	29	2.4
Feel Threatened by Japan	79	6.6	5	0.4
No Particular Reason	70	5.9	4	0.3

[1] Multiple answers possible
[2] Total number selected, including as most important

Source: High School Students' Survey

Table 2.53: Expected Major in College (N=1,185)

Major Field	Number	Percent
Applied and Professional	409	34.5
Biological Sciences	83	7.0
Social Sciences	61	5.1
Humanities	53	4.5
Language-Related	51	4.3
Physical Sciences	37	3.1
Computer Science	19	1.6
Historical	9	0.8
Area and International Studies	3	0.3
Undecided	460	38.8
Total	1,185	100.0

Source: High School Students' Survey

These interests immediately suggest a need to revamp the traditional college curriculum—and preparatory curricula as well—that has assumed literary studies to be the goal of language study and has regularly used specialists in literature, often with no training in language pedagogy, as language teachers. Clearly, the career field selected by the largest number in this sample of high school students was business, followed by technology/science. (See Table 2.54.) Indeed, it should be noted that when combined with health/medicine, the technology/science-health/medicine fields were selected by 42.3 percent of those sampled; the international affairs and government fields attracted 27.8

percent. Only a small percentage plan to enter teaching. Although it may be argued—and, one hopes, with widespread agreement—that business executives, scientists, and engineers also need a background in the humanities, clearly the primary purpose for undertaking language and cultural studies is career-related. These young people, to a striking degree, expect to be able to utilize their Japanese language training in their future careers: 43.5 percent were clear in their intention to do so, and only 7.2 percent indicated that they definitely had no such expectation.

Table 2.54: Number of Students Indicating Interest in Various Careers (N=1,143)

Areas of Career Interest	Selected[1]	Percent
Business	443	38.8
Technology/science	286	25.0
International Affairs	202	17.7
Health/Medicine	198	17.3
Arts	182	15.9
Law	177	15.5
Pre-collegiate Teaching	118	10.3
Government	115	10.1
Military	96	8.4
Social Services	88	7.7
Tourism	66	5.8
College Teaching	34	3.0
Undecided	101	8.0
Other	177	15.5

No Response = 42

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: High School Students' Survey

Suggesting some conflict with these future plans are the high attrition rates between first-year and advanced level Japanese courses, noted previously. Few are reaching meaningful levels of proficiency during high school training. Probably a higher level is expected to be reached during postsecondary study because only 9.1 percent of the students sampled are definitely planning not to enroll in Japanese classes in college, with the remainder divided between those who will continue Japanese (56 percent) and those who have not yet decided (34.9 percent) (see Table 2.43). However, the record of advanced placement based on high school achievement is discouragingly low.

The types of colleges that the students in this sample plan to attend reflect a tremendous range, from most competitive to noncompetitive, from large to small, from geographically close to home to distant. Four out of five students admitted that their choice was not influenced by that particular university's Japanese program. This may indicate either that Japanese is definitely to be no more than a minor course of study or that students are not aware of the tremendous difference in Japanese language programs among American universities, in terms of approach, emphasis, and quality.

Most Americans would at least give general support to the notion that there is need in the United States for a cadre of Japan specialists with a truly advanced level of competence in the Japanese language. A corollary to this is the widespread belief that the only way to achieve this goal is to make it possible for students to begin their study of Japanese before their college years. According to many specialists, the traditional part-time study of Japanese that typically begins in college or graduate school is simply too brief for the achievement of advanced competence in this Category 4 language. However, when the issue is raised of a unified, articulated curriculum for high school and college, objections are frequently made that high school students are totally different from college students and can be understood only by high school teachers. Unlike college students, they are said to require a special kind of curriculum that is not demanding and that calls for only a minimum of outside study. This approach sometimes manifests itself in class hours in which the teacher tells students about things Japanese—in English, of course—moving away from the language connection. Japanese language instruction may also take the form of playing games or doing puzzles.

The conflict calls for resolution: Is the goal of high school programs the presentation of a general introduction to Japan, including a limited amount of language training along with activities related to learned culture (visits to museums, cooking classes, flower arranging, etc.) and "fun" activities (games, puzzles, etc.)? Such programs may be appropriate not only for recruiting future specialists, but also for serving those who plan no more than a year or two of Japanese. (Note that, with skilled teachers, such courses can include instruction on the way to communicate effectively with the Japanese in English.) Although such courses do not require instructors highly trained as language teaching specialists, they will require staffs capable of developing and teaching a carefully developed curriculum, which is more substantial than diluted language instruction. Such courses will not propel the high school student ahead in the pursuit of high levels of Japanese language competence, but they may indeed spark an interest, in some participants, in the future study of Japanese. Although the graduates of such programs may utilize the results in their later lives, it will not be in terms of substantive Japanese language use.

In contrast, is high school Japanese intended to be serious language study, enabling the student to continue in college with advanced placement credit? Although some high school programs qualify, many seem to fall short, even if they do develop enthusiasm for the subject among some pre-collegiate students. Without a significant upgrading of the general level of high school instruction, meaningful gains in proficiency will continue to occur largely during the college years. Unfortunately, there are many programs that, without carefully defined goals, fit into neither category. In a sense, these programs are aiming at the second approach, but make so little progress that the participating student enjoys neither a well-organized introduction nor a significant advantage in a later college program. According to one former high school student, subsequently enrolled in a college program, any advantage gained through years of study in high school was lost in five weeks.

The articulation of program goals and development of curriculum show as much variation as is evident in every other phase of Japanese language study. Often goals are described in such general terms as "providing an introduction to the spoken and written language"; in some cases, the exact structural patterns and *kanji* that are introduced may be included. Little is said about orientation of the students to a Category 4 language/culture or preparation for the instrumental use of the language.

The question has been raised as to whether it would be better to teach Japanese in the high schools as an advanced placement course, open only to highly qualified students willing to apply themselves seriously. With this kind of student body, significant progress could be made, leading to advanced placement in college and the achievement of a high level of proficiency by the conclusion of a college program. This approach—condemned as undemocratic, unfair, and excessively expensive—has received little support, however.

Only one-third of the students in the survey sample indicated that they would *not* make any change in the ratio between reading/writing and speaking in their current pre-collegiate course if they had the opportunity to determine the content of their curriculum. (See Table 2.55.) The difference among the two-thirds who would like to make a change is striking: Twice as many want greater emphasis on speaking. This preference was confirmed during site visits.

Table 2.55: Desired Changes in Course Content

Desired Change	Number	Percent
More Speaking	582	49.1
More Reading/Writing	292	24.6
No Change	311	26.3
Total	1,185	100.0

Source: High School Students' Survey

Here is another example of a difference between cultures: The majority of American students enjoy learning how to *speak* a foreign language. This is particularly true in the case of students studying Japanese. Almost everyone in the sample plans to go to Japan—33.2 percent before the end of high school, 57.8 percent by the end of college. Realistically, the students know they would derive great benefit and enjoyment from the ability to speak Japanese during such a visit. The written language, identified by most teachers who are native speakers and many of those trained by them as the subject to be taught in school becomes less appealing for many American high school students when they realize the length of time it will take to be able to read any *real* materials. Thus, there comes a time when these students beg for more instruction that emphasizes speaking because they realize that, within their own time frame for learning Japanese, it will never be possible to read anything but specially prepared material in textbooks. The thought of conversing with Japanese in their own language is a strong motivating factor, particularly for those who do not plan to specialize in the language. Some students who have studied under both Japanese and American instructors have made the surprising comment that it was the American who tried to use Japanese in class, while the Japanese opted for English, concentrating on reading and translation. The latter is an example of teacher-oriented foreign language instruction: It runs counter to current American thinking, which urges the foreign language teacher to a "focus on the learner and how he or she learns."

The burgeoning increase in interest in Japanese has led to the launching of programs that provide for absolutely no meaningful monitoring or evaluation. Thus, along with the many well-organized, effective programs that are achieving good results, there are numerous others that are seriously flawed, although they are often claimed locally to be satisfactory or even better. Poor programs, whose students are tested only by locally prepared, frequently poor testing instruments and are externally measured only against programs achieving even poorer results, can be made to appear excellent. It is only when measurement is by well-designed, objective, validated tests that outcomes can be accurately interpreted and compared.

Fortunately, a project is already under way that is to produce curricular guidelines for the American high school programs of Japanese and a College Board Achievement Test. These should make possible a giant step forward toward the goal of upgrading high school Japanese (however its purpose is defined) and of enabling students to rate their own progress against validated standards.

The comment is frequently made that those problems found in Japanese programs are rampant in the programs of every foreign language in this country. That may be true, but the concern here is with a new language that is becoming part of the American pre-collegiate curriculum for the first time. Must the mistakes of the past be repeated? If this process is not delayed, is it not possible that things can be done more effectively?

Endnotes

1. U.S. Department of Education, Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1988 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1988).
2. Nontraditional language courses, such as self-study programs and computerized instruction, are not included here.

THREE

Postsecondary Instruction

The Postsecondary Setting

In spite of the rapid growth of Japanese instruction at the pre-collegiate level (reaching twice the number of college programs), it is at the postsecondary level that one finds the largest number of students, the longest established programs, and the greatest variety of course offerings. From a comprehensive data base of college-level foreign language programs maintained by the Modern Language Association, one has a general idea of the number and character of colleges and universities that offer Japanese, as well as a comparison with all institutions teaching foreign languages.[1] Standard published sources such as the annual digests of educational statistics and guides to colleges like that of Barron's allow a comparison with all higher educational institutions.[2]

The four panels of Table 3.1 provide these comparisons. As might be expected, institutions offering Japanese are disproportionately represented among the larger universities. Of those teaching Japanese, 35.9 percent have from 5,000 - 10,000 students, and 30.1 percent have more than 10,000 students. This compares with 22.9 percent and 8.0 percent, respectively, of institutions teaching any foreign language and a combined 21.5 percent of all institutions. It is somewhat surprising to note that public institutions are more likely to maintain Japanese programs, both in absolute terms and compared with language-teaching institutions and institutions in general. The geographic distribution of collegiate-level institutions teaching Japanese is, as in the case of the pre-collegiate level, more heavily represented in the Pacific Coast states and slightly underrepresented in all of the other areas, including, surprisingly, the Northeast. It is the universities, both the PhD-granting and the comprehensive institutions, that have the bulk of the Japanese programs. This reflects both the greater variety of programs that can flourish in large universities and the fact that the less commonly taught languages in general have their strongest base in this institutional class.

Table 3.1: Characteristics of Japanese Teaching, Foreign Language Teaching, and All Postsecondary Institutions*

A. Size of Institution (Number of Students)

Size	Percentage of Japanese Language Programs[a] (N=412)	Percentage of Foreign Language Programs[b] (N=2,219)	Percentage of All Institutions[c] (N=3,301)
Very Small (1,000 or fewer)	4.6	23.9	38.4
Small (1,001 - 2,000)	10.4	21.0	
Medium (2,001 - 5,000)	18.9	24.2	40.1
Large (5,001 - 15,000)	35.9	22.9	
Very Large (15,001 or more)	30.1	8.0	21.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Note: Does not include specialized institutions such as the American Graduate School of International Management or The Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Sources: [a] 1990 MLA Data Base
[b] 1989 MLA Data Base
[c] *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1988, Table 163.

B. Type of Funding

Type	Percentage of Language Programs[a] (N=412)	Percentage of Foreign Language Programs[b] (N=2,219)	Percentage of All Institutions[c] (N=3,310)
Public	61.7	54.3	45.2
Private Independent	19.4	17.4	31.0
Church-related	18.9	28.3	23.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: [a] 1990 MLA Data Base
[b] 1989 MLA Data Base
[c] *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1988

C. Regional Distribution

Region	Percentage of Japanese Language Programs[a] (N=412)	Percentage of Foreign Language Programs[b] (N=2,055)	Percentage of All Institutions[c] (N=3,396)
Northeast	20.9	22.0	25.2
South Atlantic	15.0	23.1	22.1
South Central	4.9	11.8	9.4
Midwest	23.5	24.8	26.0
Rocky Mountain	5.6	5.7	4.8
Pacific Coast	30.1	12.6	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: [a] 1990 MLA Data Base
[b] 1989 MLA Data Base
[c] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 33 (July 8, 1987): 22-30.

D. Institutional Type (Carnegie Categories)

Type	Percentage of Japanese Language Programs[a] (N=412)	Percentage of Foreign Language Programs[b] (N=2,055)	Percentage of All Institutions[c] (N=2,746)
PhD-Granting	30.6	9.9	7.8
Comprehensive	31.3	27.6	21.9
Baccalaureate	16.0	24.6	20.5
Two Year	22.1	37.9	49.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: [a]1990 MLA Data Base
[b]1989 MLA Data Base
[c]*Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 33 (July 8, 1987): 22-30.

Table 3.2 presents information in a slightly different format. It indicates the placement of the institutions offering Japanese by their rating in terms of competitiveness, that is, how difficult it is for students to gain entry.[3] The final column indicates the percentage of each category of four-year institutions that offer Japanese. Two-year colleges and specialized institutions are not normally ranked in terms of their competitiveness. Clearly, it is the more competitive institutions that are more likely to offer Japanese.

Table 3.2: Selectivity in Admissions

	Percentage of Institutions Offering Japanese		Percentage of Institutions in Category Offering Japanese
Selectivity	Number	Percent	(N=1,488)
Most Competitive	21	5.1	58.3
Highly Competitive	27	6.6	41.5
Very Competitive	75	18.2	40.8
Competitive	152	36.9	22.2
Less Competitive	30	7.3	9.1
Non competitive	15	3.6	11.5
Two-Year/Community College	91	22.1	(not ranked)
Professional/Specialized	0	0.0	-
Not Listed/Unknown	1	0.2	-
Total	412	100.0	

Source: 1990 MLA Data Base; 1986 Barron's Profiles of American Colleges

Table 3.3 is based on a later MLA survey of foreign language departments.[4] This survey indicates the nature of the campus administrative unit within which the Japanese program resides. Only two programs have their own administrative units, and five more are in units with only two languages—presumably Chinese and Japanese. Most frequently, Japanese is taught in an administrative unit that teaches three or more languages.

In short, Japanese programs are disproportionally represented among larger, publicly supported PhD-granting or comprehensive institutions, located in Pacific Coast states, which are more competitive in their admission policy. These institutions tend to administer Japanese programs in a multilanguage program. Detailed information on the organization and functioning of Japanese programs are derived from data collected by the survey itself.

Table 3.3: Administrative Unit of Japanese Program

Type of Language Program	Number	Percent
Broad Group[1]	47	11.4
Modern-Foreign Languages	284	68.9
Language Groups[2]	58	14.1
Single-Dual Languages	7	1.7
Linguistics & Comp Lit.	10	2.4
Other	6	1.5
Total	412	100.0

[1] "Broad Group" is a program or department that includes nonlanguage courses in addition to foreign language courses (e.g., humanities).

[2] "Language Groups" are programs or departments organized by groups or families of linguistically related foreign languages (e.g., Asian languages).

Table 3.3: Administrative Unit of Japanese Program (continued)

Number of Languages	Number of Languages Offered in Unit (English Excluded)	
	Number	Percent
1	2	0.5
2	20	4.9
3-6	176	42.7
7-9	142	34.5
10 or more	69	16.7
No Response	3	0.7
Total	412	100.0
Mean 6.62 Languages		

Source: 1990 MLA Data Base

According to program administrator respondents (34 target school respondents and 148 nationwide respondents, totaling 182), approximately one-half of the Japanese programs in this sample are more than six years old. A slightly smaller number (42.8 percent) are between one and six years old, and a few (7.7 percent) are less than one year old. (See Table 3.4.) Thus, although there are some new programs, a much higher number are well-established, in marked contrast with the situation at the pre-collegiate level.

Table 3.4: Number of Years Japanese Courses Offered

Number of Years	Number	Percent
Less than 1	14	7.7
1-3	41	22.5
4-6	37	20.3
More than 6	90	49.5
Total	182	100.0

Source: Postsecondary General and Targeted Administrators' Surveys

An examination of the enrollments and courses offered in the respondents' institutions (182 in number, with data from 12 additional schools not included in the data base) reveals a number of significant points. The regular pattern followed at virtually every school, except in those schools in which the Japanese program is very new, is to offer a sequence of general courses designated as elementary (first year), intermediate (second year), and advanced (third and fourth years). This terminology was obviously borrowed from the West European language heritage: However, no student who has completed only one year of part-time Japanese is ready to embark on anything even vaguely resembling truly "intermediate"-level study. There is a slight decline in the number of schools offering each succeeding level: Some programs—particularly the newest ones—may not offer anything beyond the first year, and there are those smaller programs that have no immediate plans to expand to a progression of more than two or three years of Japanese language study. In contrast, the larger programs offer special purpose courses in addition to the general courses: business Japanese (spoken and/or written), technical/scientific Japanese, advanced conversation, advanced reading, and others. Such diversity is not to be found in small collegiate programs nor in any of the pre-collegiate group. (See Table 3.5.)

Table 3.5: Enrollments in Postsecondary Courses (N=194)

Level	Enrollment	Percent	No. of Institutions Offering Course[1]	% of Institutions Offering Course	Average No. of Students
Elementary/1st Year	11,867	56.95	191	98.45	62.1
Intermediate/2nd Year	3,807	18.27	138	71.13	27.6
General Advanced/3rd Year	1,473	7.07	73	37.63	20.2
Advanced Reading	503	2.41	49	25.26	10.3
Advanced Oral	244	1.17	27	13.92	9.0
Combined Advanced Oral/Reading	33	0.16	1	0.52	33.0
Business (speaking)	366	1.76	22	11.34	16.6
Business (reading)	58	0.28	10	5.15	5.8
Technical Japanese	14	0.07	3	1.55	4.7
Literary Japanese	181	0.87	16	8.25	11.3
Pre-Tokugawa Literature	179	0.86	17	8.76	10.5
Tokugawa-WW II Literature	104	0.50	14	7.22	7.4
Post-WW II Literature	115	0.55	14	7.22	8.2
Japanese Literature (general)	5	0.02	1	0.52	5.0
Literature in Translation*	(168)	-	20	10.31	8.4
Special Purposes	1,034	4.96	43	22.16	24.0
Other (Linguistics)	48	0.22	4	2.06	12.0
Other	808	3.88	15	7.73	53.9
Total	20,839	100.00			

[1] Multiple answers possible

*Not included in language totals

Source: Postsecondary General and Targeted Administrators' Surveys

It would appear that the Japanese boom is producing a large number of students who study Japanese for only one year. For the respondent institutions, the average college enrollment in first-year Japanese in 1989-1990 was 62.1 (191 respondents), and in second-year, the average enrollment was 27.6 (138 respondents). Because most of the programs are growing these enrollments for a single year cannot be used as an exact indication of the rate of attrition. However, when one notes an almost identical drop of 67 percent in the enrollments in 1986-1988, one can at least deduce a pattern of significantly greater overall first-year enrollments compared with second year. Contributing to this difference, of course, are the newest programs, which offer only first-year Japanese. At third-year Japanese, the respondent group drops to 73, with an average enrollment of 20.2. For advanced reading, 49 respondents show an average enrollment of 10.3 students. (See Table 3.5 above.) It is not surprising that so many institutions limit their Japanese program to two years, in spite of the fact that a two-year sequence of a Category 4 language results in only low levels of competence. Obviously, offerings at higher levels become too expensive for all but the wealthiest programs, which are assisted, in many cases, by external funding.

Courses in advanced conversation number only 27 compared with 49 for advanced reading, although in the judgment of the respondents, the principal reason students are studying Japanese is related to oral skill. What is more, enrollment in both advanced conversation and reading is at about the same equally low level. There are many possible explanations for this. Yet, one is reminded of the request for more instruction in speaking at the pre-collegiate level, and the interest in instruction at teachers' workshops regarding teaching oral skills. Particularly at the advanced level, the teaching of oral proficiency becomes extremely difficult and demands specialized training.

However, so-called advanced oral courses, insofar as they are offered, are often no more than unstructured conversation hours. In spite of the instrumental goals of so many present day Japanese students, who are looking forward to using Japanese in careers in business and science, the respondents of this study report only 22 courses in Japanese for business (speaking), 10 for business (reading), and a handful in Japanese for scientists and engineers.

Preserving the more traditional goals of advanced Japanese language study are the courses in literary Japanese, which number only between 14 and 17 depending on the literary period. The combined enrollment for all these courses (398) is only slightly greater than that for oral business Japanese alone, and far less than enrollment in courses for special purposes (1,034). The difficulty of reading literature in the original in this Category 4 language is reflected in the offering of 20 courses in literature in translation. In other words, of those who are interested in Japanese literature, it would appear that all but the most advanced language students end up reading literary works only in translation.

In addition to the courses within the regular curriculum, colleges are increasingly offering special courses during the academic year and during the summer in response to student demand. The programs represented by the respondents in this study handled 1,986 students in evening courses (49 schools), 613 students in intensive summer programs (23 schools), 558 students in general summer courses (13 schools), and 243 students in Japanese for business purposes (17 schools). Technical Japanese, for which there is a serious need, had only 72 students in special programs offered at 6 schools within the repondents group. (See Table 3.6.) The rapid growth of these courses outside the usual four-year sequence in a sense marks the language's coming of age within the American education system, as it expands from the traditional, rigid, teacher-oriented course of study, offered only in daytime classes during the academic year to courses offered at special times and with a special emphasis, reflecting the needs and goals of many would-be students. (See also parts 4 and 5 of this section) This development is important when the motivation for studying Japanese is predominantly instrumental.

Table 3.6: Type of Program Offered and Enrollments

Type of Program	Number Responding	Enrollment
General summer program	13	558
Summer intensive program	23	613
Other intensive programs	5	34
Evening courses	49	1986
Japanese for Technical Purposes	6	72
Japanese for Business Purposes	17	243
Other Special Purpose Courses		
Conversation	3	125
Culture	2	15
Miscellaneous	18	364

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

Postsecondary Level Staffing

According to the program administrator respondents (34 target school respondents and 148 nationwide respondents, totaling 182), the teaching staffs at the postsecondary level are very different from the high school instructors. There are 3.5 times as many native speakers of Japanese (488) as native speakers of other languages (163) in the programs represented by the respondents: 75.0 percent of the Japanese language faculty are native speakers of Japanese. (See Table 3.7.) At the college level, there is recognition of the need for instructors with native Japanese proficiency, in addition to a more limited number who are native English speakers. Satisfaction with teachers of limited experience who possess only limited knowledge of Japanese and nonetheless operate without supervision is a feature of some pre-collegiate programs that does not extend upward. Unlike high school, concern with state certification and an interest in finding individuals already on one's staff who can add Japanese to their responsibilities do not exist.

Table 3.7: Native Language of Japanese Program Faculty (N=651)

	Native Speakers of Japanese		Percentage of All Japanese Faculty (N=651)	Speakers of Other Languages		Percentage of All Japanese Faculty (N=651)
Rank	**Number**	**Percent**		**Number**	**Percent**	
Undergraduate TA	8	1.6	1.2	8	4.9	1.2
Graduate TA	50	10.2	7.7	8	4.9	1.2
Teaching Associate	94	19.3	14.4	45	27.6	6.9
Lecturer	83	17.1	12.8	9	5.5	1.4
Instructor	109	22.3	16.7	19	11.7	2.9
Adjunct Professor	50	10.2	7.7	11	6.8	1.7
Assistant Professor	20	4.1	3.1	17	10.4	2.6
Associate Professor	34	7.0	5.2	29	17.8	4.5
Professor	20	4.1	3.1	10	6.1	1.5
Other	20	4.1	3.1	7	4.3	1.1
Totals	488	100.0	75.0	163	100.0	25.0

Source: Postsecondary General and Targeted Administrators' Surveys

Native speakers of English and native speakers of Japanese can be found as teachers of virtually every type of course and at every faculty level. However, 63.5 percent of the Japanese language faculty are Japanese native speakers who do not hold tenure-track positions (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professors). Although differences narrow at the assistant, associate and full professorial levels, there are still more Japanese native speakers, including twice as many full professors.

The survey instruments used here indicate a preference for staffs that include both native speakers of Japanese and of English: In only 39 percent of the programs are the staffs made up entirely of Japanese native speakers. The teacher respondents (131 in number) indicated that in the few programs that include both kinds of instructors, the tasks assumed by each type show a tendency to be divided in a way that reflects their respective talents. For example, at the more elementary levels, tasks related to explanation of structure and culture, counseling, and making schedules are more frequently handled by American instructors, while anything related to oral use of the language—drills and exams, for example—becomes the responsibility of the native speakers of Japanese. Other tasks are apt to be handled by both native and nonnative instructors. However, at the advanced level, virtually all responsibilities, except lectures on literature, are given to native Japanese instructors. (See Table 3.8.)

Table 3.8: Percentage of Teachers Carrying out Various Tasks, by Native Language and Level of Course[1] (N=131)

	English				Japanese				Other Languages			
	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	3rd Yr.	Adv.	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	3rd Yr.	Adv.	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	3rd Yr.	Adv
Tasks	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Lectures on Japanese Structure/Grammar	23.6	23.7	24.5	16.8	20.5	22.9	16.9	19.1	8.3	0.0	3.1	2.3
Lectures on Culture/Sociolinguistics	18.4	17.6	17.6	13.7	13.7	13.8	15.3	16.0	4.6	0.8	1.6	1.5
Lectures on Japanese Literature	12.3	9.9	16.8	19.1	6.9	6.9	8.4	7.6	0.8	0.8	2.3	4.6
Classroom Drills	16.8	13.0	11.5	8.5	30.5	29.0	24.5	20.6	6.2	0.0	0.8	3.1
Answering Questions about Grammar	29.0	24.4	21.4	14.5	20.6	21.4	19.8	22.9	7.6	0.0	3.1	4.6
Counseling Students on Course-related Problems	28.3	25.2	23.7	19.2	21.3	21.4	20.6	21.5	6.2	0.8	3.1	4.6
Making up Exams	26.0	22.2	19.9	16.8	24.4	23.0	23.7	23.7	6.9	0.8	1.6	4.7
Administering Oral Exams	21.4	17.6	14.5	8.4	29.0	27.5	24.5	22.1	7.0	0.0	1.6	2.4
Administering Written Exams	27.5	22.9	20.7	15.4	26.7	25.2	23.0	22.2	6.8	0.0	1.6	4.6
Correcting Exams/ Evaluating Results	27.5	24.5	24.4	17.6	27.5	25.2	24.5	23.0	6.9	0.8	2.4	4.7
Contributing to Assignment of Final Grades	28.3	24.4	25.3	17.6	29.0	26.0	24.5	23.7	6.1	0.8	3.1	3.9
Assigning Final Grades	24.4	22.2	23.0	16.8	23.7	22.2	22.2	20.7	6.1	0.8	3.1	4.6
Making Lesson Plans/ Schedules	26.8	21.4	24.5	16.9	21.5	20.7	22.9	22.2	6.9	0.8	3.1	4.6
Making Decisions Regarding the Curriculum	22.2	21.4	22.9	18.3	23.0	21.4	21.4	20.6	3.9	0.8	3.1	4.6
Materials Production	15.4	12.3	16.8	10.0	20.8	18.4	19.2	19.0	3.9	0.8	2.4	3.2
Other	3.9	6.9	3.9	3.9	3.1	2.3	2.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.6

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The picture that emerges is one in which American instructors serve to introduce students to this new Category 4 language, which they too learned as a foreign language, but as students become advanced, native Japanese instructors handle more teaching directly through the use of Japanese. About one-third of the respondents indicated their programs used this kind of division of labor to some extent.

Whether Japanese language teachers are native Japanese speakers or native speakers of English, the necessity for training is obvious; yet, in questions relating to this topic, a surprisingly large number of program administrators (34 target school respondents and 148 nationwide respondents, totaling 182) showed a laxness in requirements. For

148 nationwide respondents, totaling 182) showed a laxness in requirements. For graduate student teaching assistants (TAs), teaching associates, and professorial staff, very few of the directors indicated pedagogy-related requirements for becoming a teacher of Japanese as a foreign language at their institutions. Some difference emerged, although only in connection with the lecturers and instructors: More were said to require training, usually in the categories of language teaching in general or teaching Japanese more specifically. Insofar as the graduate student TAs had received training, it was most apt to involve experience in the use of the textbook/materials used in the respondents' institutions. (See Table 3.9.)

Table 3.9: Training Requirements for Employment as Japanese Language Instructor (N=182)

Rank	Teaching Japanese		Teaching a Foreign Language		Use of Materials Used in Program	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent
Graduate TA	16	8.8	12	6.6	23	12.6
Teaching Associate	15	8.2	14	7.7	11	6.0
Lecturer/Instructor	76	41.8	45	24.7	32	17.6
Professor	34	18.7	18	9.9	8	4.4

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary General and Targeted Administrators' Surveys

Lack of appropriate preparation was not compensated by in-service training after a teacher joined a faculty. Again, a solid majority of respondents checked none of the training options listed. Most often selected were individual staff discussions, although this choice, too, was selected by less than 40 percent of programs; only 18 percent required them. Programs that proceed without regular individual discussions or staff meetings and with no workshops or other pedagogy-related activities are probably not so much unified language programs as groups of independent course offerings in Japanese, in which each instructor proceeds according to his/her own bent. Because most instructors have only limited pre-training, that bent may be not only idiosyncratic, but also unsupported by any pedagogical theory or accepted professional practice relating to Japanese instruction. Everything from curricular design to test construction require more than dependence on intuition. In a language program, structured continuity is of the utmost importance to the student. Each level must build on what has gone before, if students are to make steady, organized progress. A sudden shift in approach can be very confusing to the learner. This is not to suggest that there should not be experimentation with new techniques, but such procedures should include evaluation, which leads to programwide acceptance of only those techniques that have proved valid.

Students experience problems with language teachers who have no background for the task. There is no question that native talent is a crucial ingredient in the development of a skilled pedagogue, and all the training in the world will not compensate if that talent is totally absent. Conversely, however, talent without training is not enough to prepare a person for the professional requirements of truly productive, meaningful foreign language teaching.

According to data provided by a nationwide sample of program administrators (148 in number), the most important criteria for hiring those below the professorial level are the following: ability in conducting drill classes, coursework in Japanese language, a graduate degree, and ability in developing materials (in that order). (See Table 3.10.)

Table 3.10: Importance of Factors in Employment below Professorial Rank (N=148)

Factors	Hiring Mean Level of Importance
Ability in Conducting Drill Classes	4.34
Course Work in Japanese Language	4.27
A Graduate Degree	4.25
Ability in Developing Materials	4.04
Graduate Level Course Work	4.03
Ability in Lecturing about Japanese	4.00
Attending Workshops on Teaching Japanese	3.30
Course Work in Linguistics	3.26
A Graduate Degree in Japanese Linguistics	3.15
A Graduate Degree in Japanese Literature	3.02
Course Work in Japanese Literature	2.78
A Graduate Degree in Linguistics	2.67

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

A picture emerges of new staff members being assigned principally to drill classes, probably on the assumption that this is routine and not necessarily demanding of the teacher. In fact, the sophisticated, well-trained instructor will claim that effective drilling is one of the most demanding of classroom procedures. There is also interest in an ability to prepare materials—presumably supplementary to the core materials being used. However, it is not clear how that ability is tested. A graduate degree, with no indication of the specialization, is among the more puzzling of requirements.

On the subject of the promotion of teaching associates, lecturers, instructors, and professorial staff, surprisingly few of the many categories listed were marked either as useful or necessary for promotion in this nationwide sample of program administrators (148 in number). What *are* the crucial criteria? Among the responses that related to the promotion of teaching associates, no category emerged as significantly more important than any others. The criterion receiving slightly more emphasis was the development of teaching materials. For lecturers, there were a few more responses, and development of materials again emerged as the most important criterion, this time with a wider margin being indicated (by 14.2 percent of the respondents). A still higher percentage answered in reference to instructors, perhaps an indication that promotion within and from this level was more likely. Again, the development of materials emerged as the most significant criterion (17.6 percent), followed by conducting research and publishing on Japanese language pedagogy (8.1 percent), only slightly ahead of the other criteria listed. For professors, research and publishing on linguistics was judged to be most important (12.2 percent). Next was the development of materials (9.5 percent), only slightly ahead of several other categories considered necessary for promotion, that is, presentations on linguistics and Japanese pedagogy at meetings. (See Table 3.11.)

Table 3.11: Factors Influencing Promotion by Level of Appointment (N=148)

Factors	Teaching Associate		Lecturer		Instructor		Professor	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Development of Teaching Materials	10	6.8	21	14.2	26	17.6	14	9.5
Presentations on Japanese Pedagogy	7	4.7	7	4.7	10	6.8	12	8.1
Research/Publishing: Japanese Language Pedagogy	7	4.7	6	4.0	12	8.1	10	6.8
Presentations on Linguistics	7	4.7	4	2.7	7	4.7	13	8.8
Conducting Workshops on Teaching Japanese	6	4.0	5	3.4	8	5.4	4	2.7
Research/Publishing on Linguistics	6	4.0	6	4.0	10	6.8	18	12.2
Participation in Workshops on Teaching Japanese	5	3.4	9	6.1	11	7.4	11	7.4

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey.

The emphasis on the development of materials reflects an extension of the pre-collegiate cottage industry that has the same purpose. These teaching materials are usually produced to satisfy an immediate local need, again by staff members who have no particular expertise or training for the task. They are rarely used anywhere except on the campus where they were developed. The production of high quality, lasting materials is probably the most demanding of all pedagogical challenges, requiring training, skill, time, and very hard work. It is a pity that so much overlapping effort is expended on the development of what amounts to temporary, ad hoc products. Of the 148 program directors responding, only 14 considered the development of materials necessary for promotion within the professorial ranks. Even these numbers seem inflated: Few universities count any but the most widely acclaimed, published pedagogical materials as support for promotion—if even these. Accordingly, there is little incentive for professors to devote the time, effort, and expertise necessary for the production of worthwhile materials, particularly in the area of supplementary materials.

The Postsecondary Teachers

By and large the teachers in this sample[5] are quite experienced having taught Japanese in an American postsecondary institution for an average of slightly less than seven years, but 28.7 percent among them have been teaching Japanese at their present positions for one year or less, and 66.7 percent for three years or less. (See Table 3.12.) Almost half (43.8 percent) are in the 30-39 age bracket and, as is apparently the case for teachers of all foreign languages, a decided majority (62.2 percent) are female. (See Tables 3.13 and 3.14.)

Table 3.12: Number of Years Teaching Japanese at Current Institutions

Number of Years	Number	Percent
Less than 1	37	28.7
2-3	49	38.0
4-10	26	20.1
11-15	7	5.4
16-20	6	4.7
21-25	3	2.3
26 or More	1	0.8
Total	129	100.0
No Response = 2		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.13: Age of Postsecondary Japanese Language Teachers

Age Range	Number	Percent
20-29	28	21.5
30-39	57	43.8
40-49	28	21.5
50-59	12	9.2
60 and above	5	3.8
Total	130	100.0
No Response = 1		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.14: Gender of Postsecondary Japanese Language Teachers

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	48	37.8
Female	79	62.2
Total	127	100.0
No Response = 4		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

As discussed above, teachers with native Japanese proficiency are in the majority in postsecondary instruction. Among teacher respondents (131 in number), 76.3 percent are native speakers of Japanese, and 23.7 percent are speakers of other languages. (See Table 3.15.) At this level, neither certification nor citizenship is an issue: 56 percent are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States, in contrast with the pre-collegiate level where almost 86 percent are citizens or have permanent residence. Of Japanese native speakers at the pre-collegiate level, only about 12 percent have been in the United States for less than six years compared with approximately 39 percent of the postsecondary native speakers (100 in number); 14 percent have been in the United States for less than two years. (See Table 3.16.)

Table 3.15: Native Language of Postsecondary Japanese Language Teachers

Language	Number	Percent
Native Speakers of Japanese	100	76.3
Speakers of Other Languages		
English	29	22.1
Chinese	1	0.8
Other	1	0.8
Total	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.16: Length of U.S. Residence of Native Japanese Teachers

Period of Residence	Number	Percent
Less than 2 Years	14	14.0
2-5 Years	25	25.0
6-10 Years	23	23.0
11-25 Years	26	26.0
More than 25 Years	12	12.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Two contrasting pictures emerge: At the pre-collegiate level, Japanese native speakers, who are in the minority, tend to be individuals who have lived in the United States for a considerable period of time; in a number of cases, they have been regular members of a faculty before teaching Japanese. At the postsecondary level, the Japanese native speakers (100 in number), in the majority, are more recent arrivals from Japan, who have returned to Japan within the last two years (85 percent). (See Table 3.17.) These individuals see themselves as professionally connected with the field of Japanese language teaching, at least to the point of joining the organization most widely recognized as representative of the profession.[6]

Table 3.17: Time Span Since Last Visit to Japan by Native Speaker Teachers

Period Since Last Visit	Number	Percent
Less than 1 Year	60	60.0
1-2 Years	25	25.0
3-5 Years	12	12.0
6-10 Years	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Consider now the contrast between the Japanese competence of postsecondary and of pre-collegiate nonnative teachers. With "1" representing "no usable skill" and "7" representing "ability equal to that of a native speaker," five intermediate levels were established, from survival level to one that represents the ability to "use the language occupationally and socially at the *near native* level." In rating their own proficiency in the four skills on this scale, virtually all postsecondary nonnative respondents have placed themselves at levels 5 and 6, with a smattering at levels 4 and 7. (See Table 3.18.)

Table 3.18: Self-Evaluation of Japanese Language Skills by Nonnative Speaker Teachers

Ability Level	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
	Number	Number	Number	Number
2 - Survival Level	0	0	0	1
3 - Beyond Survival, but Limited	0	0	1	1
4 - Occupational and Social Use, but with Serious Limitations	3	1	4	8
5 - Occupational and Social Use, with Only Some Limitations	14	12	9	17
6 - Occupational and Social Use, at the Near-Native Level	12	16	15	3
7 - Equivalent to Native Speaker	2	2	2	1
Total	31	31	31	31
Mean values[1]	5.42	5.61	5.42	4.74

[1] Mean values based responses on a scale of 2-7

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

One must assume that many of these levels are misinterpreted and the self-appraisals inflated. "Near native" (level 6), for example, when interpreted with the breadth of ability intended, represents a degree of competence that few non-Japanese ever achieve in a lifetime, and when so many place themselves at that level, the ratings become suspect. However, there is no question that these appraisals represent levels of proficiency far above those of the pre-collegiate teachers. In other words, although in absolute terms, these ratings may be overly high, in comparative terms, they are significant.

Confirming the higher ratings for the nonnative college teachers are the variety and duration of formal study of Japanese they have pursued. The largest group were Japanese language/literature majors in graduate school; a significant number spent an academic year in Japan, and several studied Japanese as undergraduates; some added a period of residence in Japan without formal study. Except for formal summer programs in Japan, every category of study included in the questionnaire was selected by at least two to three respondents as relevant to their Japanese language background. (See Table 3.19.)

Table 3.19: Forms of Skill Acquisition among Teachers Who Are Nonnative Speakers (N=31)

Method of acquisition	Number[1]	Percent
Pre-Collegiate Formal Study in the United States	3	9.7
Pre-Collegiate Formal Study in Japan	2	6.5
Undergraduate Japanese Language/Literature Major	7	22.6
Undergraduate Major Requiring the Japanese Language	5	16.1
Undergraduate Language Study (not major, not required)	12	38.7
Graduate Japanese Language/Literature Major	19	61.3
Graduate Major Requiring Japanese Language	6	19.4
Graduate Language Study (not major, not required)	4	12.9
Non-degree Language Study in United States	3	9.7
Non-degree Language Study in Japan	10	32.3
Academic-year Program in Japan	13	41.9
Formal Summer Language Study Program in the United States	9	29.0
Formal Summer Language Study Program in Japan	0	0.0
Studied with a Tutor	6	19.4
Learned from Spouse who is Native Speaker	3	9.7
Residence in Japan (with no formal study)	16	51.6
Other	2	6.5

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

For maintenance of their language skills, these postsecondary nonnative teachers rely on contact with native speakers, reading materials, watching movies and television, and other activities—all undoubtedly beyond the ability of most nonnative pre-collegiate teachers. (See Table 3.20.)

Table 3.20: Methods Used in Maintaining Japanese Language Skills by Teachers Who Are Nonnative Speakers (N=31)

Maintenance Methods	Number[1]	Percent
No Specific Maintenance Plan	4	12.9
Travel to Japan	14	45.2
Enrollment in Summer Language Programs in the United States	1	3.2
Enrollment in Summer Language Programs in Japan	0	0.0
Enrollment in Formal Japanese Language-related Program	2	6.5
Work with a Private Tutor	1	3.2
Self-Managed Maintenance	20	64.5
Contact with Native Speakers	27	87.1
Watch Japanese Movies, TV	21	67.7
Read Japanese Books, Newspapers, Magazines, etc.	24	77.4

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

A majority of the postsecondary respondents, both native and nonnative speakers, have a postgraduate degree—80 have a Master's degree in liberal arts and sciences and 22 in education; 41 have a doctorate in liberal arts and sciences, and 3 have one in education. (See Tables 3.21 and 3.22.) For 17 percent of the nonnative teachers with liberal arts degrees, the highest degree attained was the A.B., for 27 percent it was an

M.A., and 57 percent had a PhD degree. This contrasts strikingly with the native Japanese teachers of whom 45 percent achieved A.B.s, 33 percent had M.A.s, and 22 percent had PhDs. It seems clear that the general preference of postsecondary education for high level graduate degrees is more frequently waived for native speakers. In part, because of this generally low educational profile among native speakers, only 15.2 percent of native speakers achieved professorial rank—assistant, associate, or full professors—while 34.2 percent of the nonnative speakers achieved that status. Thus, Japanese at the college level is largely taught by native speaker teachers with appointments outside the professorial ranks. And those native speaker teachers who have attained professorial rank (10 respondents) tend to teach courses in literature (40.0 percent) or substantive courses on Japan (50.0 percent), in addition to their role in Japanese language instruction. Thus, just teaching Japanese language is not enough.

Table 3.21: Liberal Arts/Sciences Degree(s), Major and Minor Completed by Teachers by Native Language

Level	Native Speakers (N=100)		Nonnative Speakers (N=31)		All (N=131)	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Bachelor's Degree	88	88.0	27	87.1	115	87.8
Master's Degree	55	55.0	25	80.6	80	61.1
Doctorate	24	24.0	17	54.8	41	31.3
Major in Japanese (Language, Literature, and/or Linguistics)	14	14.0	15	48.4	29	22.1
Minor in Japanese (Language, Literature, and/or Linguistics)	4	4.0	4	12.9	8	6.1

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.22: College/School of Education Degree(s), Major and Minor Completed by Teachers by Native Language

Level	Native Speakers (N=100)		Nonnative Speakers (N=31)		All (N=131)	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Bachelor's Degree	9	9.0	1	3.2	10	7.6
Master's Degree	21	21.0	1	3.2	22	16.8
Doctorate	2	2.0	1	3.2	3	2.3
Major in Japanese (Language, Literature, and/or Linguistics)	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Minor in Japanese (Language, Literature, and/or Linguistics)	3	3.0	0	0.0	3	2.3

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Most of the 131 respondents indicated that they have been trained in teaching foreign languages (64.1 percent) and in teaching Japanese as a foreign language (66.4 percent) as well as developing language teaching materials (58.0 percent). About one-third admit to no training at all in these categories. Some received this training in Japan, some in the United States, and some in both locations. The nature of this training was not spelled out, but it ranged in length from less than one week to a year or more. (See Table 3.23.) In at least some cases, the longer periods of training were apparently on-the-job discussion meetings rather than formal courses.

Table 3.23: Length and Type of Training of Teachers

Length of Training	Teaching Foreign Language		Teaching Japanese		Materials Development	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Training	47	35.9	44	33.6	55	42.0
Less than 1 Week	8	6.1	10	7.6	10	7.6
1 Week	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.8
2-4 Weeks	7	5.3	16	12.2	5	3.8
5-10 Weeks	5	3.8	8	6.1	6	4.6
1 Semester	18	13.7	15	11.5	21	16.0
1 Year or More	46	35.1	37	28.2	33	25.2
Totals	131	100.0	131	100.0	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Judging from the coursework taken and offered by the respondents, literature is the specialty of a number of Japanese language teachers. The median number of literature courses the respondents have taken is five, but the median is only two for Japanese language structure courses. One might assume that native speakers have no need of structure courses in their own language until one recalls that the analysis and teaching of anything originally *acquired* outside of awareness requires conscious study.

Most of the respondents teach only language. Those who divide their time with other subjects teach Japanese literature or courses in linguistics. A number of the group (17.6 percent)—virtually all of whom are Japanese native speakers—formerly taught English as a foreign language. (See Table 3.24.) Although there may be some carryover, the difference between teaching a foreign language to one's fellow natives as opposed to one's native language to foreigners is so great as to require very different preparation. The teaching of one's native language involves conscious instruction of something that was acquired out of awareness, often dwelling on features that the native has never thought about or has never recognized as even existing. Imagine as a parallel the native American suddenly being required to explain to a class of native Japanese the use of "the" versus "a," the difference between the "t" in "top" and the "t" in "stop" and the particular environments in which each variety of "t" occurs, and the difference between questions that occur with falling intonation as opposed to those with rising intonation. Teaching a foreign language that has been *learned* is very different: No matter how little or how much of the language has been studied, no matter how accurate or inaccurate the control, the amount of knowledge (or unfortunate misinformation) there is conscious. This is a comment on the kind of knowledge, when accurate, that can help a foreigner understand the structure of a foreign language, but is in no way equivalent to actual competence in the language.

Table 3.24: Language Courses other than Japanese Currently or Previously Taught (N=131)

Courses	Currently Teaching		Previously Taught	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent
English	1	0.8	23	17.6
Japanese Literature	10	7.6	13	9.9
Japanese Culture/Civilization	7	5.3	13	9.9
Japanese Linguistics	9	6.9	6	4.6
Japanese Pedagogy	1	0.8	0	0.0
Japanese Film/Dance/Drama	6	4.6	3	2.3

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

For the majority of the respondents, the teaching of Japanese has meant working with non-Japanese students in the United States. Many have had the experience, at some point in their lives, of serving as a tutor of Japanese (for an average of about two years), but very few have ever taught the language to Japanese or students of Japanese heritage (as one teaches English to Americans) or have taught Japanese as a foreign language in Japan or other countries. Surprisingly, only 24.4 percent have had the opportunity to teach under the guidance and tutelage of a master teacher; the average length of such apprenticeships, insofar as they occurred, has been less than three years. (See Table 3.25.)

Table 3.25: Situations and Length of Time Taught Japanese (N=131)

Teaching Situation	Number[1]	Percent	Mean No. of Years
Kokugo in a Japanese Educational System	9	6.9	3.25
Nihongo to Students Exclusively of Japanese Heritage in the United States	16	12.2	5.50
Japanese to Non-Japanese Students in Japan	27	20.6	5.85
Japanese to Non-Japanese Students in the United States	111	84.7	6.97
Japanese to Non-Japanese Students in a Country Other than Japan or the United States	12	9.2	2.80
Japanese with Critique and Guidance of Master Teacher	32	24.4	2.74
Private Tutor of the Japanese Language	72	55.0	1.94

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Like their pre-collegiate counterparts, a majority of the college respondents (53.1 percent) are on annual contract: 35.4 percent are on only part-time annual appointments. This means that should a decline in interest in Japanese language study occur, staffs could be reduced proportionally almost immediately. However, in contrast with the pre-collegiate teachers, the college group includes 16.2 percent on tenure track and 11.5 percent already tenured. (See Table 3.26.)

Table 3.26: Current Term of Employment of Teachers

Term of employment	Number	Percent
Annual Contract, Part-Time	46	35.4
Annual Contract, Full-Time	23	17.7
Multiyear Contract	16	12.2
Tenure Track	21	16.0
Tenured Position	15	11.5
Other	9	6.9
Total	130	100.0
No Response = 1		

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding.
Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The respondents range from graduate TAs to full professors and have been teaching Japanese at their current institutions for an average of one to five years. (See Table 3.7 above.) Depending on the individual, this experience may range from less than 1 year to 26 years. (See Table 3.27.) The average teaching load is almost 8 hours per week—again, an average that covers a wide range, extending to a maximum of 20 hours. (See Table 3.28.) Compensation for most of the respondents (80.9 percent) is in the form of salary, although 43.5 percent receive tuition and/or stipend benefits. (See Table 3.29.) There seems to be some limited concern about salary inequities: 18.6 percent feel that Japanese teachers are paid less than teachers of other languages. (See Table 3.30.) What one does not find at the college level are individuals already on a faculty teaching other subjects who are then brought into a Japanese program on the basis of having knowledge of an undefined amount of Japanese.

Table 3.27: Number of Years at Current Institutions among Teachers

Number of Years	Number	Percent
Less than 1	3	2.3
1 - 5	98	76.0
6 - 10	11	8.5
11 - 15	7	5.4
16 - 20	6	4.7
21 - 25	3	2.3
26	1	0.8
Total	129	100.0
No Response = 2 Mean = 4.76		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.28: Number of Hours per Week Spent Teaching

Number of Hours	Number	Percent
None	1	0.8
1 - 5	30	23.4
6 - 10	71	55.5
11 - 15	22	17.2
16 - 20	4	3.1
Total	128	100.0
No Response = 3 Mean = 7.87		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.29: Form(s) of Compensation (N=131)

Form of Compensation	Number[1]	Percent
Tuition/Fees (or waiver)	33	25.2
Housing (or housing allowance)	3	2.3
Stipend	24	18.3
Salary	106	80.9
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.30: Comparison of Compensation of Japanese Instructors with Teachers of Other Languages

Levels of Comparison	Number	Percent
Do Not Know if There is a Difference	58	45.0
Teachers of Japanese Are Paid *Less* Than Other Language Teachers	24	18.6
Teachers of Japanese Are Paid the *Same* as Teachers of Other Languages	41	31.8
Teachers of Japanese Are Paid *More* than Teachers of Other Languages	6	4.6
Total	129	100.0
No Response = 2		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

As noted above, according to information provided by the program director respondents, less than 30 percent of the teachers who staff Japanese language programs are in the professorial ranks (i.e., adjunct, assistant, associate, and full professors). (See Table 3.7 above.) Many in that category are actually specialists of literature, particularly junior professors, who are required to teach language courses. When asked about their non-Japanese language course responsibilities, 63.6 percent of the teachers who indicated that they are currently in the professorial ranks stated that they are currently teaching Japanese literature at their institutions; 71.4 percent indicated that they taught Japanese literature when they were first hired. (See Table 3.31.) From enrollment figures, one can discern that most students of Japanese are studying language, particularly at the elementary level, but few are studying literature. The age-old myth that literature professors are automatically able to teach language is particularly inapplicable to a Category 4 language, in which students are primarily motivated and interested in oral skills. There are also professors who serve as the only member of a Japanese staff. That person will teach whatever courses are offered, and elementary courses will be most in demand.

Table 3.31: Non-Japanese Language Courses Taught when First Hired and at Present by Teachers of Professorial Rank

Courses	Taught when First Hired (N=14)		Teaching At Present (N=22)	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent
Japanese Literature	10	71.4	14	63.6
Language Courses Other than Japanese	1	7.1	4	18.2
Courses on Japan Other than Language or Literature	7	50.0	11	50.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Reports are currently circulating concerning a paradigm that is developing among some newer Japanese language programs. At the start, native Japanese who are among the small band who *have* been well trained in Japanese language pedagogy are hired, as lecturers or graduate TAs to inaugurate new programs in Japanese. As the programs flourish, thanks to effective instruction and curricula that match the students' interests and goals, the administration of these schools decides it is time to move to permanent programs with a tenure-track professor. The successful language teachers are terminated and replaced by PhDs in literature who have no training—and often little serious interest—in teaching language courses. These professors become so busy trying to cope with ongoing multilevel language programs that they have little time to spend on their specialization. What is more, there is comparatively little interest in literature among these students who, unable to read literary works, usually have instrumental goals for studying Japanese. All in all, the fit is bad, and what started out as limited but well taught programs can move into a sad decline.

Of all the responsibilities connected with a Japanese language program, those with which the fewest teacher respondents claim a connection are the discussion of literature and the production of materials. Usually literature courses are taught only by the tenure-track specialists and, because comparatively few students are studying literature, the number of teachers involved is significantly reduced. Only a small group of respondents are required to develop materials. There exists a large number of college textbooks on the market. For whatever methodology one adopts, there is typically a Japanese textbook available, although the development of supplementary materials may still appear to be a comparatively widespread activity. The emphasis the program directors place on an ability to develop materials and the claim that this skill is important in some promotions undoubtedly refers to this assumption, even though not many teachers are actually involved in the task. (See Table 3.32.)

Table 3.32: Responsibilities of Teachers at Various Levels (N=131)

Tasks	1st Year Number[1]	2nd Year Number[1]	3rd Year Number[1]	Advanced Number[1]
Lectures on Japanese Structure/Grammar	63	41	34	29
Lectures on Culture/ Sociolinguistics	36	28	24	21
Discussing Literature	7	11	13	16
Classroom Drills	74	47	28	17
Answering Questions about Grammar	74	45	42	34
Counseling Students on Course-related Problems	69	52	41	36
Making up Exams	71	43	38	26
Administering Oral Exams	72	46	31	21
Administering Written Exams	68	48	39	28
Correcting Exams/Evaluating Results	74	51	45	34
Contributing to Assignment of Final Grades	71	44	37	29
Assigning Final Grades	73	46	41	33
Making Lesson Plans/Schedules	78	44	41	31
Making Decisions Regarding the Curriculum	67	43	42	38
Materials Production				
Text	2	1	2	2
Readings	10	8	7	7
Supplementary	13	12	11	6
Tapes	6	4	3	2
Other	40	25	16	16
Other	28	21	27	16

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

A smaller, but still significant, group of respondents has no responsibility for lecturing on culture/sociolinguistics. The impression created is that, unless relevant material is included in the program's textbook, Japanese is being taught merely as a linguistic code, with limited reference to the way the language is used within Japanese society. For a Category 4 culture, students cannot hope to achieve accuracy by guessing the language appropriate to a given situation on the basis of English; the result of such an assumption is "speaking English in Japanese."

Japanese programs receive good support from their departments, according to the teacher respondents, with particularly strong backing from their immediate supervisors and their students. (See Table 3.33.) Support from other faculty and the community at large is less strong. The majority of the respondents spend about two hours preparing for each class hour, and as much as 88 percent spend between one and three hours. (See Table 3.34.) In addition, the teacher respondents spend, on the average, 11 hours per week on nonclassroom responsibilities. Like the pre-collegiate teachers, 62.5 percent of the college respondents believe they put in more hours than their colleagues who teach other languages. It would appear that at least *this* Category 4 language is more difficult to teach, as well as to learn. (See Table 3.35.)

Table 3.33: Mean Level of Support for Language Programs by Source (N=131)

Support Level	Mean Level of Support[1]
Immediate Supervisor	4.01
Students	3.98
Department	3.54
Language Laboratory Supervisor	3.48
Institution as a Whole	3.02
Other Language Faculty	2.92
Community at Large	2.84
Nonlanguage Faculty	2.66
[1]Based on a scale of 1 to 5 in which 1 is "extremely unsupportive" and 5 is "extremely supportive"	

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.34: Time Spent Preparing for Each Class Hour

Number of Hours	Number	Percent
No Preparation Time	5	3.9
1	36	27.9
2	45	34.9
3	32	24.8
4	8	6.2
5	2	1.6
6	1	0.8
Total	129	100.0
No Response = 2 Mean number of hours = 2.09		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.35: Japanese Teachers' Estimates of Time Demand Compared with Other Languages

Time Required	Number	Percent
Less	1	0.8
Same	44	36.7
More	75	62.5
Total	120	100.0
No Response = 11		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The Postsecondary Program

In the assessment of the division of time among the four skills, there is a general tendency among teachers to claim higher percentages for the oral skills in the early years and gradually to increase the amount of reading and writing in the higher level courses, although reading is regularly assigned more time than writing. It is not surprising that 72 percent did not know how their allocation of time compared with that of teachers of other languages, but it *is* surprising that 37 percent admitted they could not compare their own practices with those of other Japanese teachers at the same institution. Once again, the question arises as to whether or not a true Japanese *program* exists when a group of individual Japanese courses are taught by instructors who proceed independently according to their individually preferred approaches. Thus, in contrast with the more usual division of the skills noted above, there are examples of every conceivable variation, offered by teachers who have different notions as to what is best.

When questioned about the division of class time among the four skills at different levels of instruction, the average of the program administrators' replies showed the kind of progression that reflects the importance of an initial emphasis on oral skills. Class time devoted to speaking fell from an average of 36.09 percent in first year to 26.17 percent in third year, and listening fell from 30.81 percent to 21.66 percent. Conversely, reading rose from 19.10 percent to 32.09 percent and writing from 16.11 percent to 24.90 percent at the same levels of instruction. (See Table 3.36.)

Table 3.36: Skill Emphases in Japanese Classes by Level

Level	Number Responding	Mean Percentage of Emphasis			
		Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
Elementary/1st Year	138	36.09	30.81	19.10	16.11
Intermediate/2nd Year	99	30.10	26.16	24.18	20.62
Advanced/3rd Year	54	26.17	21.66	32.09	23.90

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

However, these are mean scores, and when individual institutions are examined, one finds enormous differences. There are programs in which the speaking component occupies 100 percent of the first-year course and others with only 10 percent. There are second-year courses in which the reading is still at only a 10 percent level and writing at 0 percent. Even at the third-year level, there are programs in which speaking accounts for as much as 50 percent and as little as 0 percent of class time. It is hoped that these differences are related to dissimilar goals, but it would be useful to measure the results of divergent approaches with effective testing instruments. Procedures based totally on individual assumptions (without examining the results) can unfortunately perpetuate less effective methodologies.

Neither the questionnaire responses nor the site visits indicate that any of the classroom skills being taught are equivalent, as one moves from instructor to instructor or from institution to institution. The emphasis placed on communication and context in some courses may be totally missing in others, in which "speaking" takes the form of mechanical drill practice or even the oral translation of isolated sentences. The fact that speaking and listening are not given equal emphasis suggests that oral communication, which usually involves both active and receptive skill, is not the primary focus in a number of programs. "Reading" may lead to related discussion in Japanese or only to translation into English. "Writing" may refer to the mechanical writing of characters or to the preparation of Japanese-style discourse. The terms themselves represent an enormous range of interpretation by individual teachers, reflected clearly in the ultimate proficiency of the students.

If the predictions of the student respondents (624 in number) are accurate, the study of Japanese will continue to grow at least in the immediate future. For each course mentioned in the survey—including courses on business Japanese, literature, and technical Japanese—future enrollments will exceed the number currently enrolled. Of course, it must be understood that those future high enrollments are not expected to occur within one year, but they *are* expected to involve the individuals who responded. As an example, the 271 students now taking first-year Japanese will probably form the bulk of next year's second-year class, predicted at 213. This represents an attrition rate of only 21 percent, less than that found in the past. To be sure, these future predictions are no more than that: Many students will undoubtedly change their minds as they reach more advanced levels of difficulty in the language. One should remember the enrollment patterns that have existed until now, particularly the low enrollment in advanced courses. It is hoped this enrollment will increase, but any such change will probably be gradual. (See Table 3.37.)

Table 3.37: Courses Previously Taken, Now being Taken, or Will be Taken by Students (N=624)

	Previously Taken	**Now Taking**	**Will Take**
Courses	**Number**[1]	**Number**[1]	**Number**[1]
Elementary (1st Year)	353	271	1
Intermediate (2nd Year)	153	181	213
General advanced (3rd Year)	75	91	275
Advanced Reading	27	49	182
Advanced Oral	27	38	175
Japanese for Business (Speaking)	12	21	101
Japanese for Business (Reading)	5	12	91
Technical Japanese	5	5	63
Literary Japanese	12	17	83
Japanese Literature (pre-Tokugawa)*	19	9	54
Japanese Literature (Tokugawa-WW II)*	12	5	56
Japanese Literature (post-WW II)*	18	15	60
Japanese Literature in Translation	71	29	73
Japanese for Special Purposes	14	1	23
Other	19	9	21

[1]Multiple answers possible

*Not in translation

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

The majority of the teachers who submitted survey instruments declined to break down by percentage the weight given to each of the four skills in determining a student's final grade in each level of instruction, with the exception of first year. At the elementary level, on the average, most emphasis was placed on speaking and least on reading: 32.62 percent on speaking, 26.46 percent on listening, 23.69 percent on writing, and 22.33 percent on reading. The considerable gap between speaking and listening suggests again that, for some teachers at least, speaking at this level is equated with oral translation, probably of isolated sentences, rather than engaging in communicative conversation that requires comprehension for meaningful participation. Writing at this level undoubtedly involves drawing characters and, again, working on translation or writing from dictation, rather than composing connected discourse. More time is apparently spent on such activities, on the average, than on handling the related passive skill, reading. (See Table 3.38.)

Table 3.38: Mean Emphasis Given to Various Skills at First Year Level of Instruction (N=131)

Skills	First Year (mean percentage)
Speaking	32.62
Listening	26.46
Reading	22.33
Writing	23.69

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The college teachers' approaches to the teaching of reading are as lacking in consensus as those used by the pre-collegiate teachers. Of the 131 teacher respondents, 57 or 43.5 percent use romanization, at least for beginning instruction. Both Hepburn-style *romaji* and an adaptation of *kunrei-shiki* are about equally used; the latter is probably a reflection of the usage of a widely used textbook. (See Table 3.39.) There are three ways in which *kana* is used: for the representation of all Japanese, following several introductory lessons during which romanization is used (45.1 percent); from the very beginning, representing all Japanese (35.2 percent); and introduced and used only as appropriate for adult written Japanese (19.7 percent). (See Table 3.40.) Again, following the system used in teaching Japanese children to read their native language, *hiragana* is a strong favorite (70 percent) to be taught first. The slight increase in the number of college teachers who begin with *katakana,* compared with pre-collegiate teachers, can probably be attributed to its initial use in one particular textbook.

Table 3.39: System(s) of *Romaji* Used and Taught by Teachers (N=57)

	Used		Taught	
System	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent
Kunrei-shiki	7	12.3	5	8.8
Hepburn	21	36.9	12	21.1
Nippon-shiki	3	5.3	3	5.3
Jorden/*Japanese:The Spoken Language*	23	40.4	17	29.9
Other	1	1.8	1	1.8

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.40: The Way *Kana* is Used by Teachers

Utilization	Number	Percent
From the Beginning of the First Lesson, with No Use of Romanization, for all Japanese Presented at That Time	43	35.2
After Several Lessons, for Everything Presented in Japanese, Replacing Romanization that Was Introduced Originally	55	45.1
Introduced and Used Only as Appropriate for Adult Written Japanese	24	19.7
Total	122	100.0
No Response = 9		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

It is the claim of 60 percent of the teachers that they teach *kanji* in context, although a significant number (47 percent or 61 respondents) use *kanji* cards—*kanji not* in context—not only for self-study by students, but also for instruction and practice in class. (See Table 3.41.) "Teaching in context" is apparently interpreted as "sometimes in context." The student respondents confirm this: In their judgment, *kanji* are introduced individually and in context to an almost equal degree. Most of the teacher respondents (94 percent) indicate that, in teaching reading, they distinguish between written style and the representation of spoken style. It is not clear how this is handled in classes that use *kana* from the first day: Are the students writing written style or spoken, and do they know which it is? Do they speak and write differently from the very beginning of their instruction?

Table 3.41: The Way *Kanji* Cards are Used (N=61)

Utilization	Number[1]	Percent
Self-Study by Students	37	60.7
Instruction in Class	42	68.9
Practice in Class	47	77.0
Testing	11	18.0
Other	1	1.6
[1]Multiple Answers Possible		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The introduction of *kanji* is even more individualistic at the college level than at the pre-collegiate level. In first semester, although the average is 42 characters, the maximum is 200; in first year, the average is 145, but in some programs as many as 510 are introduced; in second year, an average of 386 are lost in the maximum of 800; and, in third year, the average is 806, but the maximum at 2,000 exceeds even the standard list of approved characters, which contains only 1,945. (See Table 3.42.)

Table 3.42: Mean and Maximum Number of *Kanji* Taught (N=131)

Period of Instruction Ending	Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught	Maximum Number of *Kanji* Taught
1st Semester	42	200
1st Year	145	510
2nd Year	387	800
3rd Year	806	2,000

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

There is a definite contrast between native and nonnative instructors in the pace with which they introduce *kanji*. During the first semester and first year, the nonnative teachers introduce an average of 24 and 96 *kanji* respectively, compared with 46 and 156 introduced by native Japanese teachers. The nonnative teachers, both pre-collegiate and collegiate, who are more intimately aware of the multiple difficulties of embarking on the study of Japanese, hold back on *kanji* introduction; they are probably those who place more emphasis on oral skills during initial training. Native instructors, who began their schooling already in control of the linguistic code of the language, associate the learning of Japanese with the study of *kanji* from the very beginning. However, starting in second year, an interesting change takes place: Nonnative instructors, apparently assuming that students are now ready to learn *kanji* at a more rapid rate, actually exceed the Japanese native instructors in the pace at which they introduce *kanji*. Thus, in second year, the native Japanese introduces an average of 380 *kanji* compared with the nonnative instructor's average of 404, and, in third year, the comparison is 788 (native Japanese) to 860 (nonnative Japanese). (See Table 3.43.)

Table 3.43: Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught by Teachers of Japanese by Native Language

Period of Instruction Ending	Speakers of Other Languages Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught (N=31)	Native Speakers of Japanese Mean Number of *Kanji* Taught (N=100)
1st Semester	24	46
1st Year	96	156
2nd Year	404	380
3rd Year	860	788

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

In the teaching of Japanese, English continues to be an important auxiliary language. The largest percentages of teacher respondents assigned its use to explaining grammar and meaning during and outside of class, to lectures explaining grammar and culture, and to general and social conversation outside of class. Although the native and nonnative instructors agreed on these as the most common types of English usage, surprisingly, a greater percentage of the native Japanese instructors seem to be users of English—and in some of the very areas in which native speakers of Japanese encounter the most difficulty. Explaining through the use of a foreign language the structure of one's native language, which was acquired without awareness, is no easy task and is certainly one that requires specialized expertise and close-to-native proficiency in English. Here is an area that must be learner-oriented if it is to be at all effective. (See Tables 3.44 and 3.45.)

Table 3.44: Situations and Level(s) of Instruction in Which English is Used by Nonnative Speakers (N=31)

	First Year		Second Year		Third Year		Fourth Year	
Situations	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
To Provide Vocabulary Items During Class	9	29.0	4	12.9	4	12.9	1	3.2
To Provide Translation During Class	11	35.5	9	29.0	12	38.7	7	22.6
To Explain Meaning During Class	13	42.0	10	32.3	12	38.7	6	19.3
To Explain Pronunciation During Class	9	29.0	6	19.3	6	19.3	2	6.4
To Explain Grammar During Class	16	51.6	13	42.0	13	42.0	5	16.1
To Discuss Literature* During Class	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	6.4	5	16.1
To Explain Grammar, Meaning, Pronunciation, etc. Outside of Class	15	48.4	14	45.2	13	42.0	6	19.3
In Lecture, to Explain Culture, Grammar, etc.	14	45.2	11	35.5	12	38.7	5	16.1
To Counsel, Advise and Encourage in Class	10	32.3	8	25.8	8	25.8	5	16.1
In General or Social Conversation, Outside of Class	11	35.5	13	42.0	14	45.2	7	22.6
In Class, with No Clear Pattern	1	3.2	2	6.4	1	3.2	0	0.0
Outside of Class, with No Clear Pattern	3	9.7	3	9.7	4	12.9	2	6.4
Never	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Established Policy	1	3.2	3	9.7	1	3.2	0	0.0
Other	1	3.2	1	3.2	1	3.2	1	3.2

[1] Multiple answers possible

*Not including literature in translation

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.45: Situations and Level(s) of Instruction in Which English is Used by Native Speakers (N=100)

	First Year		Second Year		Third Year		Fourth Year	
Situations	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
To Provide Vocabulary Items During Class	29	29.0	14	14.0	8	8.0	1	1.0
To Provide Translation During Class	37	37.0	18	18.0	12	12.0	4	4.0
To Explain Meaning During Class	51	51.0	19	19.0	8	8.0	3	3.0
To Explain Pronunciation During Class	27	27.0	5	5.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
To Explain Grammar During Class	60	60.0	30	30.0	10	10.0	4	4.0
To Discuss Literature* During Class	12	12.0	5	5.0	3	3.0	1	1.0
To Explain Grammar, Meaning, Pronunciation, etc. Outside of Class	57	57.0	23	23.0	9	9.0	3	3.0
In Lecture, to Explain Culture, Grammar, etc.	49	49.0	18	18.0	5	5.0	4	4.0
To Counsel, Advise and Encourage in Class	46	46.0	18	18.0	4	4.0	4	4.0
In General or Social Conversation, Outside of Class	50	50.0	16	16.0	9	9.0	4	4.0
In Class, with No Clear Pattern	12	12.0	5	5.0	1	1.0	2	2.0
Outside of Class, with No Clear Pattern	20	20.0	8	8.0	8	8.0	4	4.0
Never	6	6.0	3	3.0	7	7.0	14	14.0
No Established Policy	4	4.0	1	1.0	3	3.0	1	1.0
Other	3	3.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

*Not including literature in translation

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Both native and nonnative instructors predictably decrease their use of English as their students become more proficient in Japanese. This was confirmed through questionnaires submitted by the student respondents. However, according to their assessment, their teachers are most apt to use English to explain meaning and provide translation during class. A picture emerges of class hours, particularly in first-year courses, that are a mixture of Japanese and English, with no dependence on the monolingual use of Japanese for communication. (See Table 3.46.)

Table 3.46: Students' Identification of Language Used by Teachers in Various Instructional Circumstances (N=624)

	English			Japanese		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
Situation	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]	No.[1]
When Providing Translation During Class	350	163	45	131	157	122
When Explaining Meaning During Class	359	153	44	165	193	136
When Explaining Pronunciation During Class	182	62	16	281	221	136
When Explaining Grammar During Class	340	148	44	144	166	119
When Discussing Literature During Class*	129	66	25	61	93	93
When Explaining Grammar, Meaning, Pronunciation, etc. Outside of Class	313	132	42	127	137	112
In Lecture to Explain Culture, Grammar, etc.	305	119	25	134	178	132
To Counsel, Advise, and Encourage in Class	229	97	31	246	195	128
In General of Social Conversation, Outside of Class	243	111	42	234	196	123
In Class, with No Clear Pattern	124	65	20	188	141	89
Outside of Class, with No Clear Pattern	139	76	25	145	120	76
Never	12	14	16	9	5	1
No Established Procedure	20	13	5	24	12	8
Other	6	6	0	9	5	1

[1] Multiple answers possible

*Not including literature in translation

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

For explanations of grammar and pronunciation, most students go to native Japanese teachers, particularly professors, who are more apt to have had specialized training in these areas. (See Table 3.47.) Native Japanese teachers, of course, are generally more numerous. Outside of class, students speak Japanese with their fellow Japanese language students. (See Table 3.48.) Unfortunately, because this is not practice with native speakers, depending on the ability of one's classmates, it may only help to become more fluent in speaking inaccurate Japanese. Next in frequency is speaking with Japanese friends. This has greater possibilities for a student's improvement, provided the friends have some appreciation of what level of practice is needed. This is extremely difficult for native speakers who have no training or experience in teaching their language as a foreign language. For beginning students, contact with unabridged speech can be as frustrating as watching a foreign film in an unknown language without subtitles, and attempts by untrained native speakers to explain their language may only cause further confusion. Again, one must remember that Japanese is a Category 4 language.

Table 3.47: Who Answers Questions on Grammar, Pronunciation, and Culture (N=624)

	Questions on Grammar and Structure of Japanese			
	Speakers of Other Languages		Native Speakers of Japanese	
Position	**Number[1]**	**Percent**	**Number[1]**	**Percent**
Graduate Teaching Assistant	51	8.2	168	26.9
Teaching Associate	23	3.7	101	16.2
Lecturer	15	2.4	65	10.4
Instructor	21	3.4	197	31.6
Professor	88	14.1	295	47.3
	Questions on Japanese Pronunciation			
Graduate Teaching Assistant	26	4.2	125	20.0
Teaching Associate	10	1.6	59	9.5
Lecturer	3	0.5	43	6.9
Instructor	25	4.0	150	24.0
Professor	49	7.9	240	38.5
	Questions on Japanese Culture			
Graduate Teaching Assistant	17	2.7	86	13.8
Teaching Associate	7	1.1	40	6.4
Lecturer	15	2.4	48	7.7
Instructor	28	4.5	141	22.6
Professor	70	11.2	251	40.2

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.48: Individuals Outside of Class with Whom Students Speak in Japanese (N=624)

Individuals	**Number[1]**	**Percent**
No One	95	15.2
Fellow Japanese Language Students	378	60.6
Japanese Friends	326	52.2
Japanese Language Instructors	276	44.2
Other	106	17.0

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Even at the postsecondary level, the teacher respondents seem to enjoy activities that are thought to be motivational, even if they provide little or limited linguistic gain for the learner. These activities include performing skits (60.3 percent), playing games (45.8 percent), singing Japanese songs (30.5 percent), and presenting aspects of Japanese culture with limited language involvement (39.7 percent). (See Table 3.49.) However, there is a marked difference between the use of such activities by native Japanese instructors as compared with use by nonnative instructors. Could it be that the limited competence of foreign students makes them seem like children to native-speaker teachers, thereby suggesting more childlike activities? Whatever the reason, the question that some of the best trained native and nonnative teachers ask is whether such activities are, in fact, any more motivational than skilled language instruction that matches student goals. (See Tables 3.50 and 3.51.)

Table 3.49: Techniques Used in Instruction by All Teachers (N=131)

Techniques	Number[1]	Percent
Perform Skits	79	60.3
Play Games	60	45.8
Sing Japanese Songs	40	30.5
Present Aspects of Japanese Culture with Limited Language Involvement (i.e. Origami, Tea Ceremony)	52	39.7
Videos	12	9.2
Other	18	13.7
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.50: Techniques Used in Instruction by Native Speaker Teachers (N=100)

Techniques	Number[1]	Percent
Perform Skits	63	63.0
Play Games	48	48.0
Sing Japanese Songs	33	33.0
Present Aspects of Japanese Culture with Limited Language Involvement (i.e., Origami, Tea Ceremony)	41	41.0
Videos	11	11.0
Other	12	12.0
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.51: Techniques Used in Instruction by Nonnative Speaker Teachers (N=31)

Techniques	Number[1]	Percent
Perform Skits	16	51.6
Play Games	12	38.7
Sing Japanese Songs	7	22.6
Present Aspects of Japanese Culture with Limited Language Involvement (i.e., Origami, Tea Ceremony)	11	35.5
Videos	1	3.2
Other	6	19.4
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

With the dramatic increase in pre-collegiate Japanese language instruction, it is expected that more and more graduates of such training will exist among college enrollments in the future, but of the teacher respondents, slightly fewer than one-half now have students in their beginning level classes who previously studied Japanese in high school. Slightly more than one-half of those instructors find their performance, after six weeks of instruction at the introductory level, to be about the same as that of true beginners; 8.1 percent find them worse, and only 37.1 percent find that they perform better. (See Table 3.52.) It would be interesting to check their assessment at a slightly later point in the course because it is during the very early stages of training that these students are most apt to have an advantage. One former high school student, trained in a program in which most of the students believed that Japanese was easier for Americans to learn than French, found to his amazement that his years of high school training provided an advantage in a first-year college course for only five weeks. A frequently expressed reaction of former high school students was surprise at how quickly college courses progressed and how rapidly college students learned.

Table 3.52: Teachers' Comparison of Performance of Students with Pre-Collegiate Instruction after Six Weeks of Postsecondary Instruction

Judgment	Number	Percent
Significantly Better Than Those with No High School Japanese	23	37.1
Substantially the Same as Those with No High School Japanese	34	54.8
Significantly Worse Than Those with No High School Japanese	5	8.1
Total	62	100.0
No Response = 69		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

The postsecondary students' own assessment of their performance, compared with that of the true beginners, differed slightly from that of their teachers: About one-half thought they performed better, but the remainder were divided almost equally between those who thought they were approximately the same and those who thought they were worse. (See Table 3.53.) It is clear that, at this juncture, most high school instruction in Japanese is not propelling students forward to a higher level of competence at the collegiate level.

Table 3.53: Students' Judgments of Results of High School Japanese Training

Judgment	Number	Percent
Significantly Better Than Those with No High School Japanese	40	56.3
Substantially the Same as Those with No High School Japanese	15	21.2
Significantly Worse Than Those with No High School Japanese	16	22.5
Total	71	100.0
No Response = 553		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

It would appear, from the survey responses, that teachers use a number of procedures for determining placement of former high school students of Japanese. The most commonly used method for placement is an exam—usually an individual oral interview and/or a locally prepared test of grammar. (See Table 3.54.) A few respondents claimed use of standardized tests—Educational Testing Service (ETS) or American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)—but it is surprising that these would ever actually be used. (See Tables 3.55 and 3.56.) Both are expensive; what is more, the ETS test gives ratings that are significant only at levels of competence achieved by very few high school students indeed, and an ACTFL test is official only if conducted by a certified tester, currently unavailable at most schools. Because placement testing is useful only if geared to a program's particular curriculum, for this purpose, locally designed tests are usually preferred over the global tests of overall proficiency represented by the ETS and ACTFL examinations. In some cases, self-placement is permitted, particularly when students elect to begin again from the beginning, saying "I didn't learn anything in high school." There are also rumors to the effect that some elect to begin again, thinking mistakenly that this is the route to an "easy A."

Table 3.54: Criteria Used in Placing Students with Prior Japanese Instruction (N=131)

Criteria	Number[1]	Percent
Years of Study	23	17.6
Courses Completed	27	20.6
Examination	84	64.1
Other	17	13.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.55: Types of Placement Exams Used (N=131)

Type of Placement Exam	Number[1]	Percent
Standardized Exam Developed by a Testing Organization	6	4.6
Written Translation Test from Another Teaching Institution	0	0.0
Locally Written Translation Test	11	8.4
Written Examination on Structure/Grammar from Another Teaching Institution	3	2.3
Locally Written Examination on Structure/Grammar	54	41.2
Locally Developed Oral Comprehension Test	28	21.4
Individual Oral Interview	61	46.6
Other	9	6.9

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.56: Standardized Tests Used (N=131)

Standardized test	Number[1]	Percent
ETS	5	3.8
Center for Applied Linguistics	0	0.0
ACTFL (certified tester)	8	6.1
ACTFL-Type Test (not certified)	7	5.3
Other	1	0.8

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

In an additional survey of 96 high school alumni, their placement was checked against the amount of high school training they had completed. Of the 29 who had completed one year of high school Japanese, 81.5 percent began again in college; three were able to enter second semester of first year. Of the 18 who had completed two years in high school, 55.5 percent returned to the initial course in college; even after three years in high school, 54.1 percent began again, and after four years, 42 percent returned to first semester of first year in college. (See Table 2.45.) Given this placement pattern, it is surprising that a higher percentage of the high school alumni do not appear to be at least significantly better in their college classes. The high school teachers themselves expected higher placement for their students, particularly for those who had completed two years of high school study. (See Table 2.44.) This is another indication of the lack of understanding and coordination among the pre-collegiate and collegiate faculties in regard to levels of proficiency.

Although there may be fewer Japanese courses taught by instructors with low levels of competence at the college level, there is tremendous individual variation in both high school and college in training in Japanese pedagogy and in approaches to teaching Japanese. As a result, differences are to be found everywhere. As long as the graduates of one high school move on to a number of different colleges, all of which offer different types of Japanese language instruction, articulation may be a problem even for high school students who were taught by a superior high school teacher. Among the student respondents who indicated their views on transition from high school to college, four times as many found it smooth as found it difficult, for all skills except listening, for which the transition was even easier (5:1). However, it must be pointed out once more that most of the high school alumni were beginning again, thereby virtually eliminating problems of transition. It becomes a serious question only when students join a more advanced course. If a superior student whose high school program emphasized reading enters a college program that begins with emphasis on the spoken language, for example, advanced placement will continue to be a rarity—and unduly hard on the student, when it does occur. Given the tremendous variation in the rate of introduction of *kanji* in both high school and college, for example, the chances for smooth transition to an advanced level in the reading component are very poor indeed. Close articulation between the pre-collegiate and postsecondary levels may never be possible, but at least the alumni of high school programs should have a recognizable head start.

The fluidity of the transition from course to course within one institution is predictable: For each of the student respondents who found it difficult, between five and six found it smooth, and this applies to all skills. What *is* surprising is that even more do not find the transition smooth. Again, there is evidence of Japanese being offered on at least some campuses not as an integrated program, but rather as a collection of isolated courses, with instructors making independent decisions without reference to the teaching of their colleagues. (See Table 3.57.)

Table 3.57: Students' Rating of Articulation Between Programs/Levels of Japanese Language Instruction by Various Skills[1] (N=624)

Program/Level	Speaking						Listening					
	Smooth Transition		Difficult Transition		Cannot Say		Smooth Transition		Difficult Transition		Cannot Say	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
From High School to College	53	8.5	14	2.2	16	2.6	57	9.1	11	1.8	14	2.2
From Other Institutions to the Program at Current Institution	95	15.2	27	4.3	19	3.0	104	16.7	21	3.4	17	2.7
From One Course to Another at Current Institution	185	29.6	35	5.6	17	2.7	191	30.6	32	5.1	14	2.2

Program/Level	Reading						Writing					
	Smooth Transition		Difficult Transition		Cannot Say		Smooth Transition		Difficult Transition		Cannot Say	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
From High School to College	53	8.5	14	2.2	16	2.6	55	8.8	15	2.4	13	2.1
From Other Institutions to the Program at Current Institution	73	11.7	44	7.0	25	4.0	70	11.2	43	6.9	29	4.6
From One Course to Another at Current Institution	185	29.6	34	5.4	16	2.6	184	29.5	33	5.3	18	2.9

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

The teachers in this sample clearly believe in the importance of evaluation: 60 percent give a daily grade for classroom performance. Examinations take various forms: The chosen form for each course is, in many cases, surprising. The individual oral interview is the only format that is an accurate test of speaking ability, yet, the average number of administrations of this kind of test in first year courses (2.23), when speaking is claimed to be given its strongest emphasis, is slightly less than in second year (2.67) and third year (2.71). The average number of administrations in advanced *oral* courses is only 1.94 and in business/*speaking* courses 2.14! Compare now the average number of times that written translation exams are given: 6.08 in first year, 8.05 in second year, 4.03 in third year, 4.86 in advanced reading, 5.04 in advanced *oral* courses, 6.00 in business/*speaking*, and 4.67 in business/reading. (See Table 3.58.) Obviously, teachers favor particular examination formats, and the modalities these formats test may not always be closely correlated with the stated emphases of the courses in which they are used. If one accepts the maxim that "students study in preparation for the test," it is not surprising if students spend less time at their tape recorders when exams involve written translation, for example.

Table 3.58: Mean Number of Evaluations per Semester Using Various Measures

	Course/Level of Instruction		
	Elementary/First Year	**Intermediate/Second Year**	**General Advanced/ Third Year**
Criteria	**Mean Evaluations**	**Mean Evaluations**	**Mean Evaluations**
Written Translation Exam	6.08	6.05	4.63
Written Examination on Structure	6.45	5.90	4.40
Oral Comprehension Exam	4.23	4.67	2.40
Individual Oral Interview	2.23	2.67	2.71
General Reading Exam	4.77	5.35	4.85
General Writing Examination	5.73	6.06	7.94
Other	8.90	9.12	6.73
	Advanced Reading (Third Year or Greater)	**Advanced Oral (Third Year or Greater)**	
	Mean Evaluations	**Mean Evaluations**	
Written Translation Exam	4.86	5.04	
Written Examination on Structure	3.84	4.61	
Oral Comprehension Exam	2.12	3.65	
Individual Oral Interview	1.79	1.94	
General Reading Exam	2.86	3.36	
General Writing Examination	4.73	4.75	
Other	5.75	6.67	
	Business/Speaking	**Business/Reading**	
	Mean Evaluations	**Mean Evaluations**	
Written Translation Exam	6.00	4.67	
Written Examination on Structure	5.37	4.60	
Oral Comprehension Exam	4.29	2.33	
Individual Oral Interview	2.14	2.00	
General Reading Exam	2.50	2.33	
General Writing Examination	5.30	3.63	
Other	4.00	3.33	

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Despite this apparently poor match, on the average, between test format and what is supposed to be the emphasis of some courses, a majority of college students of Japanese (83 percent) feel that their exams accurately measure what they have learned in class. This suggests that the mismatch is in the expected course emphasis. Insofar as exams have raised problems, 20 percent mentioned an unfamiliar test format, 17 percent unfamiliar activities not practiced in class, and 13 percent material not covered during class time. (See Table 3.59.) Clearly, the complaints are minor. However, although most students (71 percent) are given a clear indication of their strengths and weaknesses after major exams, a majority of the respondents (53 percent) feel they are not given such an assessment beforehand.

Table 3.59: Problems Reported by Students when Taking Japanese Language Exams (N=624)

Problems	Number[1]	Percent
Unfamiliar Test Format	125	20.0
Testing Included Material not Covered in Class	81	13.0
Testing Included Written or Spoken Activities that Were Not Practiced During Regular Class	106	17.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

A solid majority of program administrators indicate that the material that is taught, the method, and the particular textbook used in their Japanese program is made by a member of their Japanese faculty. To a markedly lesser degree, the decision maker has training in Japanese pedagogy or foreign language pedagogy, has a degree in Japanese literature or Japanese studies, or has other Japanese language-related background. This is further confirmation that the Japanese postsecondary teaching field is influenced by a significant number of individuals who have not been specifically trained as language teachers, even though they may have extensive knowledge of the language and/or background in Japan-related studies. (See Table 3.60.)

Table 3.60: Who Makes Instructional Decisions (N=148)

	What to Teach		How to Teach		Text		Combined	
Characteristics	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
An Administrator Without a Teaching Position	5	3.4	4	2.7	4	2.7	2	1.4
A Member of the Language Department Faculty	32	21.6	22	14.9	17	11.5	13	8.8
A Member of the Japanese Language Faculty	106	71.6	102	69.0	108	73.0	95	64.2
Teaches Another Asian Language	3	2.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0
Has a Background in Asian Studies	19	12.8	16	10.8	17	11.5	13	8.8
Has a Degree in Japanese Studies	21	14.1	22	14.9	24	16.2	20	13.5
Has a Degree in Japanese Literature	22	14.9	22	14.9	22	14.9	21	14.2
Has Other Japanese Language-Related Background	46	31.1	45	30.4	46	31.1	40	27.0
Has Training in Foreign Language Pedagogy	46	31.1	47	31.8	42	28.4	39	26.4
Has Training in Japanese Language Pedagogy	55	37.2	55	37.2	57	38.5	49	33.1

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

In choosing an introductory text, the feature considered to be of most importance by the teacher respondents is the availability of audiotapes, and, second in importance is the quality of the grammatical explanations. Drills and exercises are also very important to a majority (55.7 percent) of the respondents, but only 45.8 percent feel that authenticity of the Japanese used is very significant. (See Table 3.61.)

Table 3.61: Importance of Factors in Choosing an Introductory Text (N=131)

Factors	Unimportant		Important		Very important	
	No.[1]	Percent	No.[1]	Percent	No.[1]	Percent
Use of *Kana*	15	11.5	37	28.2	57	43.5
Use of *Romaji*	51	38.9	31	23.7	14	10.7
Use of *Kanji*	22	16.8	50	38.2	34	26.0
Specific Emphasis on Reading/Writing	27	20.6	50	38.2	24	18.3
Specific Emphasis on Speaking	5	3.8	35	26.7	64	48.9
Combination of Speaking and Reading	12	9.2	33	25.2	57	43.5
Quality of Grammatical Explanations	3	2.3	29	22.1	77	58.8
Simplicity of Grammatical Explanations	12	9.2	39	29.8	52	39.7
Rapid Introduction of Grammar	51	38.9	38	29.0	14	10.7
Authenticity of the Japanese Used	12	9.2	31	23.7	60	45.8
Simplicity of the Japanese Material	29	22.1	44	33.6	23	17.6
Style of Material Appropriate for Non-Japanese	23	17.6	47	35.9	35	26.7
Rapid Introduction of Vocabulary	48	36.6	48	36.6	8	6.1
Rapid Introduction of *Kanji*	58	44.3	33	25.2	10	7.6
Re-introduction of Vocabulary	18	13.7	48	36.6	38	29.0
Usefulness of Vocabulary	1	0.8	44	33.6	58	44.3
Drills and Exercises	3	2.3	29	22.1	73	55.7
Availability of Supplementary Materials	1	0.8	26	19.8	54	41.2
1. Audiotapes	3	2.3	25	19.1	80	61.1
2. Videotapes	7	5.3	39	29.8	57	43.5
3. Video Disks	33	25.2	32	24.4	25	19.1
4. Workbooks	19	14.5	35	26.7	38	29.0
5. Other Materials	3	2.3	8	6.1	4	3.1
Other	1	0.8	0	0.0	2	1.5

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

There are numerous college textbooks on the market, which are aimed at various levels of instruction. The three texts most commonly used by the teacher respondents are the same three that surfaced as most widely used of the college texts in high schools (although to a very limited degree). In first- and second-year courses, texts by Jorden are used most commonly, followed by the Young texts and the Mizutani texts. In third-year courses, the Hibbett texts are used, as well as Young's and Jorden's, and by the fourth year, the variety has become as great as the population is small. (See Table 3.62.)

Table 3.62: Texts Used by Level of Instruction (N=131)

	First Year		Second Year		Third Year		Fourth Year	
Text	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
Gakken, *Japanese for Today*	2	1.5	3	2.3	2	1.5	1	0.8
Hibbett and Itasaka, *Modern Japanese*	0	0.0	9	6.9	12	9.2	0	0.0
Hibbett and Itasaka, *Advanced Reading*	0	0.0	2	1.5	3	2.3	6	4.5
Jorden, *Beginning Japanese*	11	8.4	4	3.1	1	0.8	1	0.8
Jorden and Chaplin, *Reading Japanese*	7	5.3	7	5.3	5	3.8	0	0.0
Jorden with Noda, *Japanese: The Spoken Language*	46	35.1	32	24.4	14	10.7	3	2.3
Jorden and Noda, *Japanese: The Written Language*	26	19.8	21	16.0	8	6.1	2	1.5
Mizutani, *Introduction to Modern Japanese*	28	21.4	16	12.2	1	0.8	0	0.0
Mizutani, *Newspaper Japanese*	0	0.0	2	1.5	2	1.5	1	0.8
Mizutani (Intermediate Text)	0	0.0	2	1.5	2	1.5	2	1.5
Watabe, *Toward Better Japanese*	0	0.0	4	3.1	2	1.5	0	0.0
Young, *Learn Japanese* (College)	21	16.0	20	15.3	12	9.2	4	3.1
Selections from Books, Newspapers, Magazines	3	2.3	6	4.6	8	6.1	5	3.8
Locally Made Materials	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.8
Other	10	7.6	13	9.9	18	13.7	3	2.3

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Although only about one-third of the teacher respondents use locally prepared basic text materials, more than double that number use locally prepared supplementary materials. However, in only 25 cases are these materials used anywhere except at the campus at which they were prepared. This is a reminder of the pre-collegiate preparation of materials, which are totally lacking in coordination or organization to provide needed information while, at the same time, preventing duplication. Is the question one of quality? If, in fact, most of these materials are hastily prepared, and not worthy of more widespread circulation, are they nevertheless of sufficient quality for use locally? On the other hand, recognition may be involved. Teachers who devote their own time to the preparation of materials for their own students may not always be willing to turn those materials over to other programs without the benefit of copyright, attribution, and royalties. This issue requires further investigation.

Unfortunately, a majority of the student respondents are not receiving instruction on the ways to study Japanese most effectively (53 percent), the ways to use their text most effectively (58 percent), or the way to use audiotapes and the language laboratories most effectively (over 50 percent). To some degree, this can be a reflection of the fact that the majority of teachers are native speakers of Japanese, for whom explanations of this kind can be very difficult without specific training. The challenge for these teachers is to describe the means by which members of a culture foreign to them can best study their own native language and culture, which they acquired without any conscious effort. (In the case of the writing system, the effort *was* conscious. But native Japanese learners are already fluent speakers, with total control of the basic grammatical structures before they start to read.) The fact that a slightly higher percentage of students do receive instruction in the use of tapes and language laboratories undoubtedly reflects the fact that more teachers at least describe the available tapes for a given course, and laboratory attendants often provide a basic introduction to the laboratory.

Orientation in the broadest sense—treatment of the nature of language, the primacy of the spoken language, out-of-awareness acquisition vs. conscious learning, speaking a language vs. speaking about a language, the analysis of spoken language vs. the analysis of written language, the nature of reading, the four skills, pragmatics, etc.—seems to be given little attention in language classes. Students can emerge from years of study of a number of languages without ever having given these matters a thought. These topics take on more obvious and critical importance in the study of a Category 4 language, with a totally foreign system of writing, but whether the foreign language is Spanish or Japanese, the average American student receives little background instruction.

Judging from the respondents, most college teachers of Japanese realize the importance of the use of language tapes in the learning of foreign languages. Although pre-collegiate teachers may share this view, most of their schools do not have language laboratories, and they have not attempted to develop substitutes in their classrooms. Even nonnative speakers do not seem to bother to use readily available audiocassettes made by native speakers. Of the college respondents, 84 percent expect students to study with tapes, 45.9 percent of the sample expect students to use them from 30 minutes to 1 hour per day. (See Table 3.63.) (The students themselves indicated that these expectations are not being realized.) Almost one-half of the respondents also use language videotapes in class. In most cases (64 percent), videos that coordinate with the text are used. Almost one-half also make the videos available outside of class.

Table 3.63: Expectations of Use of Audiotapes

Expected Study Time	Number	Percent
No Expectations	15	13.8
Less than 30 Minutes Each Day	28	25.7
Between 30 Minutes and 1 Hour Each Day	50	45.9
More than 1 Hour Each Day	15	13.8
Other	1	0.8
Total	109	100.0
No Response = 22		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

For 92 percent of the student respondents, audiotapes specifically coordinated with their courses are available—undoubtedly a reflection of the fact that most college students, at least in elementary and intermediate courses, are using published texts that have accompanying tapes. This contrasts sharply with the situation at the pre-collegiate level, in which the use of locally developed materials is so prevalent. In those cases, accompanying tapes typically have not been made. Also working against the use of tapes in pre-collegiate programs, crucial though it may be for language learning, is the scarcity of language laboratories and the limited amount of time most pre-collegiate students devote to outside study.

Although tapes are available for most college students, in contrast with teacher expectations, student use is surprisingly low, suggesting a concentration on book learning. Unfortunately, one cannot learn to speak a language by reading a textbook. Of the student respondents, 27 percent never use tapes, and 52.7 percent use them less than one half hour a day. Only 17.2 percent use them between 30 and 60 minutes a day, and a mere 3.1 percent use them more than 1 hour per day. (See Table 3.64.)

Table 3.64: Reported Use of Audiotapes by Students

Time	Number	Percent
Do Not Use Them	155	27.0
Less than 30 Minutes Each Day	303	52.7
Between 30 Minutes and 1 Hour Each Day	99	17.2
More than 1 Hour Each Day	18	3.1
Total	575	100.0
No Response = 49		

Source: Postsecondary Student's Survey

Thus a picture emerges of many teachers who pay lip service to the importance of tapes and recommend their extensive use, but apparently do little to enforce this use. Without proper orientation, students faced with homework that involves memorization of *kanji* and tape practice are apt to concentrate on the former. There is a tendency to try to replace tape work with less time-consuming study of the textbook version of the taped material. American students focus their outside study on preparation for exams: Unless tests of oral competence are emphasized, it will be slighted in students' individual application, and it has already been noted that there is a general preference among teachers for written examinations.

For those students who use audiotapes, an average of 38 percent of the practice time is spent in the language laboratory. The vast majority (91 percent) own their own tape recorders. Because most are not able to rent tapes (56 percent) or borrow them on overnight loan (58 percent) or for more than two days (55 percent), it is not surprising that the majority (55 percent) own their own tapes. The limited use of language laboratories is attributed to a number of reasons, in particular to the fact that they are not of any particular use and that they are boring. (See Table 3.65.) These reasons suggest that most faculties are not developing and exploiting the special advantages a modern laboratory can offer—utilizing video and interactive video disc software, machines that record students' voices in comparison with native speakers', computer programs, special exercises not printed in the textbook, and other materials. In some instances, budgetary constraints may be involved, but often teachers are failing to keep abreast of modern technology.

Table 3.65: Reasons Given by Postsecondary Students of Japanese for Not Using Language Laboratories (N=624)

Reasons	Number[1]	Percent
Not of Particular Benefit	196	31.4
Study in the Language Laboratory is Boring	165	26.4
Inconvenient Hours of Operation	86	13.8
Inconvenient Location	82	13.1
Poor Recording Quality	79	12.7
Uncomfortable (seating, headsets, etc.)	76	12.2
Already Spend Sufficient Time There	76	12.2
Insufficient Supply of Tapes	27	4.3
Insufficient Number of Tape Players	7	1.1
Inappropriate Equipment	12	1.9
Equipment Not Adequately Maintained	19	3.0
Poor Lighting	12	1.9
Too Noisy to Study	31	5.0
Other	210	33.7
[1] Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Teachers were clear in their negative reaction to the suggestion that classroom Japanese might be altered to make it easier for students. In contrast with the minority who consider use of authentic Japanese language in a textbook to be very important, a significant majority agreed that only language naturally used by adult native speakers of Japanese should be used. Most (58.5 percent) think that the language taught should be natural, adult-style Japanese, but a sizable number (38.2 percent) opt for language specifically appropriate for students' status as foreigners. Almost none of the teachers (3.3 percent) think it is acceptable to alter the language to make it easier for students. (See Table 3.66.) However, there is considerable evidence that much of the language taught in a number of programs is, in fact, a "neutralized" variety quite unlike authentic Japanese. That is to say, at the discourse level, the requirements of cultural settings and special features of spoken vs. written language are ignored, as students speak and read a kind of dialect used only by foreigners. As was mentioned previously, the way in which *kana* is used during the early periods of instruction in many programs is an example of nonauthentic adult writing style. There appears to be a gap between what is intended and what actually occurs, in some classrooms, at least.

Table 3.66: Teachers' Expectations of Future Language Use by Students

Expectations	Number	Percent
Students May Use Language that is Easier for Them, Even If It Is Unnatural	4	3.3
Students Should Use Natural Japanese that is Specifically Appropriate for Their Status as Foreigners	47	38.2
Students Should Use Any Language Naturally Used by Adult, Native Speakers of Japanese	72	58.5
Total	123	100.0
No Response = 8		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

A solid majority (80.9 percent) of the teachers express support for speaking at normal speed and with normal intonation. A different approach, perhaps unconscious, is followed by many teachers, who use a talking-to-foreigners style of speech that does not occur among adult Japanese. For some instructors, it seems to become a special classroom dialect, developed through long experience with foreign students. A majority of the teacher respondents (65.9 percent) believe that pronunciation is very important, but only 34.4 percent believe in strict correction of student errors in pronunciation and grammar. The majority (54.2 percent) subscribe to moderate correction, apparently with the expectation that students will gradually begin to correct their own errors. (See Tables 3.67 and 3.68.) This conclusion, however, is another area that calls for empirical research.

Table 3.67: Importance Teachers Place on Proper Pronunciation

Importance	Number	Percent
Not Very Important	3	2.3
Moderately Important	41	31.8
Very Important	85	65.9
Total	129	100.0
No Response = 2		

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.68: How Teachers Deal with Mistakes in Grammar and/or Pronunciation

Method	Number	Percent
With Minimal Correction	8	6.1
With Moderate Correction	71	54.2
With Strict Correction	45	34.4
No Response	7	5.3
Total	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Most of the teachers (74 percent) feel that their approach to teaching Japanese and their pedagogical technique have changed since they began teaching. This does not necessarily equate with improvement, however: It can mean no more than experimentation with approaches that have long since proved ineffectual elsewhere. For many, there is an assumption that experience can serve as a substitute for training. This is particularly evident in the many "position available" advertisements that include a requirement for experience, but mention no professional training. There is no question that, of course, experience does bring about confidence, and in the performance of many teachers, improvement. But this is not always true. In the worst scenario, it makes a substandard teacher really confident in being substandard! This accounts for the refusal on the part of many "training conscious" program supervisors to hire untrained teachers who have had extensive experience, on the grounds that their unprofessional style of teaching is so firmly fixed as to make them untrainable. On the other hand, in cases in which genuine improvement does accompany added experience, one wonders whether training might not have accelerated the process. When statements like the following are made: "I was a terrible teacher for my first few years. Now at last I know what I am doing," one feels great pity for those students who suffered through an experience that could surely have been avoided, had professional requirements for teachers been more strict.

Postsecondary Students

There were 624 postsecondary students who returned the survey instruments. These students attend schools that represent a range of institutional types from two-year junior colleges to PhD-granting universities. The significant majority (83 percent) came from the latter category. The selectivity of the students' institutions included representation from all levels, but the largest number came from "very competitive" (28 percent), "most competitive" (23.4 percent), and "competitive" (20.5 percent) schools, a reminder of the self-selection process that was at work in the pre-collegiate programs: Japanese has regularly appealed to more capable and more highly motivated students at all levels, although this may change as study of the language becomes more generally available. (See Table 3.69.) The gender ratio shows a slight preponderance of males (53 percent: 47 percent). Almost one-half of these students are in arts and sciences/humanities (49.3 percent), with the next largest groups in graduate school (14.2 percent), business/management (9.6 percent), and engineering/technology (5.1 percent). (See Table 3.70.) Most of the respondents are full-time students (91 percent) in degree programs (90 percent) at the undergraduate level (81.1 percent). At the MA/MBA level, respondents accounted for 8.7 percent, with 5.9 percent working toward their PhD degree. (See Table 3.71.) Almost one-quarter already hold other degrees.

Their current major fields of study show a wide range, with more than one-quarter of the respondents indicating specialization in some field related to Japan and/or East Asia. Business is the choice of 9.0 percent, economics of 5.5 percent, and international relations of 4.8 percent, with engineering (4.5 percent) and the physical sciences (2.7 percent) following behind. (See Table 3.72.) The apparent divergence with the plans expressed by the pre-collegiate students may not be as great as it appears because many of the Japan-related majors undoubtedly have business connections. The comparatively advanced average age of 23 of the student respondents reflects the fact that 15.3 percent are postgraduates. Among the undergraduates, most students of Japanese are sophomores (24 percent), followed closely by juniors (22.6 percent). Only 17.8 percent are freshman and 16 percent seniors. (See Table 3.73.) This suggests a preference for a two-year course of study, beginning in the sophomore year. Except for 23 native speakers of Chinese, and 6 each of Japanese and Korean, virtually all of the respondents are native speakers of English. (See Table 3.74.) A few more have experienced languages other that English in their homes. In addition to the 23 Chinese, 18 had parents who spoke Japanese and 7 Korean; European language speakers were almost nonexistent. (See Table 3.75.)

Table 3.69: Selectivity of Institutions in Which Students Are Enrolled

Selectivity	Number	Percent
Community College/Technical School	43	6.9
Special	1	0.2
Noncompetitive	67	10.7
Less Competitive	26	4.2
Competitive	128	20.5
Very Competitive	175	28.0
Highly Competitive	31	5.0
Most Competitive	146	23.4
Other	7	1.1
Total	624	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.70: Type of College/School Attended

Type of College/School	Number	Percent
Arts and Sciences/Humanities	174	49.3
Graduate	50	14.2
Business/Management	34	9.6
Engineering/Technology	18	5.1
Agriculture	1	0.3
Law	2	0.6
Medical/Health Profession	1	0.3
Human Ecology/Family Science	2	0.6
Other	71	20.1
Total	353	100.0
No Response = 271		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.71: Degree Program in Which Students Are Enrolled

Type of Program	Number	Percent
BA/BS	455	81.1
MA/MBA	49	8.7
PhD	33	5.9
Law	4	0.7
Other		
Joint MA/MBA	16	2.9
MA/PhD	1	0.2
Health Profession	2	0.4
Other	1	0.2
Total	561	100.0
No Response = 63		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.72: Majors of Students Studying Japanese

Major	Number	Percent
Humanities (art, music, philosophy, etc.)	21	3.4
Language-Related	2	0.3
Language and Literature	12	1.9
Linguistics	9	1.4
Chinese Language and Literature	4	0.6
Comparative Literature	1	0.2
Japanese	44	7.1
Japanese Literature	2	0.3
TESOL/Foreign Language Teaching	4	0.6
English	10	1.6
History	14	2.2
Social Sciences (anthropology, political science/government, etc.)	39	6.3
Economics	34	5.5
International Relations	30	4.8
Area studies and Interdisciplinary Studies	1	0.2
Area Studies (general)	10	1.6
Asia/East Asian Studies	59	9.5
Natural Sciences (biology, ecology, etc.)	12	1.9
Physical Sciences (physics, chemistry, etc.)	17	2.7
Computer Science	9	1.4
Joint Majors	5	0.8
Japanese/Miscellaneous	21	3.4
Japanese/Economics	7	1.1
Japanese/International relations	5	0.8
Japanese/Government	2	0.3
Japanese/Business	5	0.8
Applied and Professional		
Architecture	19	3.0
Business	56	9.0
Education	3	0.5
Engineering	28	4.5
Health Professions	5	0.8
Law	2	0.3
Other	48	7.7
Undecided	84	13.5
Total	624	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.73: Class/Level of Students of Japanese

Class	Number	Percent
Freshman	107	17.8
Sophomore	144	24.0
Junior	136	22.6
Senior	96	16.0
Graduate	92	15.3
Other	26	4.3
Total	601	100.0
No Response = 23		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.74: Native Language of Students (N=624)

Native Language	Number[1]	Percent
English	541	86.7
Japanese	6	1.0
Other Asian language		
Chinese	23	3.7
Korean	6	1.0
Other	34	5.4
Other European language		
French	1	0.2
German	1	0.2
Spanish	1	0.2
Other	12	1.9
Non-European/Asian	11	1.8
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.75: Language(s) Used at Home by Parents of Students of Japanese (N=624)

Native Language	Number[1]	Percent
English	538	86.2
Japanese	18	2.9
Other Asian language		
Chinese	23	3.7
Korean	7	1.1
Other	41	6.6
Other European language		
French	1	0.2
Spanish	2	0.3
Other	23	3.7
Non-European/Asian	15	2.4
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

The student respondents have had extensive experience in studying other languages: 276 have studied French, 264 Spanish, and 130 German. As many as 95 have studied Latin, and 50 have studied Chinese. The suggestion is that those who take Japanese enjoy the study of foreign languages: They are not taking Japanese *instead* of other more frequently studied languages, a fear expressed by some members of language faculties. (See Table 3.76.)

Table 3.76: Other Language(s) Studied by Students of Japanese (N=624)

Language(s)	Number[1]	Percent
French	276	44.2
Spanish	264	42.3
German	130	20.8
Russian	27	4.3
Italian	31	5.0
Latin	95	15.2
Chinese	50	8.0
Korean	14	2.2
Other Asian Language	18	2.9
Other European Language	25	4.0
Other	41	6.6

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Surprisingly, one-half of the student respondents have already been to Japan, and 36 percent for more than a year; in fact, more than one-half of the group were in Japan for six months or more, and nearly two-thirds of them were there at some time between the ages of 19 and 25. For the most part, these students were not two-week tourists. (See Tables 3.77 and 3.78.) Clearly, today's students, many starting at an early age, are well traveled.

Table 3.77: Period of Residence in Japan of Students of Japanese

Length of Residency	Number	Percent
Less than 1 Month	67	22.4
1-5 Months	75	25.1
6 Months to 1 Year	49	16.4
More than 1 Year	108	36.1
Total	299	100.0

No Response = 325

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.78: Age of Students of Japanese Resident in Japan for Six Months or More (N=157)

Age	Number[1]	Percent
10 Years Old or Younger	15	9.6
11-18 Years Old	36	22.9
19-25 Years Old	101	64.3
Older than 25 Years Old	18	11.5
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Of the student respondents, 43.4 percent study Japanese a total of between four and eight hours per week outside of class; 33.9 percent study more. (See Table 3.79.) The greatest amount of study time is spent on the written language: an average of 40 minutes a day studying Japanese reading materials; 37 minutes translating Japanese into English, 31 minutes studying *kanji,* and 32 minutes studying other work on written Japanese. Significantly less time is spent on the spoken language: an average of 31 minutes is spent on the spoken language text, other work on the spoken language takes 31 minutes, practicing dialogues takes 27 minutes, and doing oral drills takes 26 minutes. Thus teachers' preferred testing formats and the obvious desire of the students to excel in school have serious implications on the time they devote to particular methods or development of language skills. (See Table 3.80.)

Table 3.79: Number of Hours per Week Outside of Class Spent Studying Japanese

Number of Hours	Number	Percent
None	2	0.3
Less than 3	138	22.4
4-8 Hours	268	43.4
9 or More	209	33.9
Total	617	100.0
No Response = 7		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.80: Mean Time (in Minutes) Students Spend Daily on Various Homework (N=624)

Homework	Mean Time
Studying Japanese Reading Materials	39.94
Translating from Japanese to English	36.61
Studying Japanese Grammar/Structure	31.66
Studying *Kanji*	31.40
Other Work on Written Japanese	31.96
Studying the Spoken Language Text	30.71
Other Work on Spoken Language	30.80
Practicing Dialogues	26.51
Doing Oral Drills	25.67

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

In the judgment of the teachers, most (57.3 percent) students of Japanese spend between four and eight hours per week on class preparation. More students (25.2 percent) are believed to spend less than that amount than those who spend more (13.7 percent). (See Table 3.81.) Most of the teachers (64.1 percent) are satisfied with the amount of time the students devote to their Japanese studies, but more (19.1 percent) consider student preparation poor rather than excellent (13.7 percent). (See Table 3.82.) Fifty-five percent are generally satisfied with attendance, with 38.9 percent finding it excellent. (See Table 3.83.) In comparing the amount of time spent studying Japanese with that given to other languages, about one-quarter of the students indicated they were unable to make a comparison. Of those who could, four times as many students indicated that they spent more time on Japanese.

Table 3.81: Number of Hours per Week Students Spend on Class Preparation

Number of hours	Number	Percent
Less than 3	33	25.2
4-8	75	57.3
9 or More	18	13.7
No Response	5	3.8
Total	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.82: Teachers' View of the Quality of Student Preparation

Quality of preparation	Number	Percent
Poor	25	19.1
Satisfactory	84	64.1
Excellent	18	13.7
No Response	4	3.1
Total	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.83: Teachers' View of Student Classroom Attendance

Quality of Attendance	Number	Percent
Poor	3	2.3
Satisfactory	72	55.0
Excellent	51	38.9
No Response	5	3.8
Total	131	100.0

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Why are these postsecondary students studying Japanese? Aside from noting a general interest in Japan, the teacher respondents cite as students' principal motivations the desire to understand spoken Japanese, improve their job opportunities, speak Japanese fluently, and be able to use job-related Japanese. (See Table 3.84.) With a slight difference in order of importance, these goals, recognized by the teachers, are identical with those listed by the college students themselves and coincide with those of the pre-collegiate students as well. Yet, the match with the curricula of most institutions, both pre-collegiate and postsecondary, is not very good. There is apparently strong instrumental motivation for studying Japanese and a dominant interest in the spoken language among present day students. (See Table 3.85.)

Table 3.84: Teachers' Views of Reasons for Students Studying Japanese (N=131)

	Not a Reason		Reason for Some		Reason for Most		Reason for All	
Reason	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
General Interest in Japan	1	0.8	34	26.0	58	44.3	29	22.1
To Do Something Different	9	6.9	94	71.8	8	6.1	0	0.0
To Speak Japanese Fluently	1	0.8	56	42.7	49	37.4	16	12.2
To Understand Spoken Japanese	1	0.8	37	28.2	58	44.3	27	20.6
To Read Japanese Literature in Japanese	22	16.8	94	71.8	3	2.3	1	0.8
To Read Japanese Technical Literature	23	17.6	92	70.2	2	1.5	0	0.0
To Read Japanese Journals, Magazines, etc.	12	9.2	87	66.4	21	16.0	0	0.0
Required by Field of Specialization	14	10.7	96	73.3	7	5.3	5	3.8
To Be Able to Live in Japan	7	5.3	92	70.2	17	13.0	2	1.5
To Be Able to Use Job-Related Japanese	0	0.0	63	48.1	47	35.9	15	11.5
To Improve Job/Career Opportunities	0	0.0	44	33.6	64	48.9	18	13.7
To Speak to Japanese Friends	5	3.8	98	74.8	18	13.7	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	18	13.7	0	0.0	0	0.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Table 3.85: Students' Reasons for Studying Japanese (N=624)

Reason	Not a Factor		Minor Factor		Major Factor		Most Important	
	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%	No.[1]	%
General Interest in Japan	11	1.8	142	22.8	365	58.5	68	10.9
To Do Something Different	231	37.0	173	27.7	114	18.3	5	0.8
To Speak Japanese Fluently	27	4.3	102	16.3	388	62.2	61	9.8
To Understand Spoken Japanese	16	2.6	91	14.6	456	73.1	15	2.4
To Read Japanese Literature in Japanese	162	26.0	206	33.0	148	23.7	10	1.6
To Read Japanese Technical Literature	270	43.3	144	23.1	86	13.8	2	0.3
To Read Japanese Journals, Magazines, etc.	119	19.1	236	37.8	172	27.6	9	1.4
Required by Field of Specialization	270	43.3	110	17.6	122	19.6	10	1.6
To Be Able to Live in Japan	129	20.7	173	27.7	215	34.5	13	2.1
To Be Able to Use Job-Related Japanese	51	8.2	122	19.6	355	56.9	26	4.2
To Improve Job/Career Opportunities	52	8.3	133	21.3	326	52.2	58	9.3
To Speak to Japanese Friends	152	24.4	185	29.6	189	30.3	7	1.1
To Speak to Japanese Relatives	404	64.7	30	4.8	54	8.7	6	1.0
Family is of Japanese Heritage	431	69.1	20	3.2	36	5.8	5	0.8
Easy Because of Background	413	66.2	52	8.3	30	4.8	3	0.5
Best Choice for Schedule	452	72.4	22	3.5	12	1.9	2	0.3
Reputation of the Program	305	48.9	133	21.3	54	8.7	2	0.3
General Intellectual Curiosity	115	18.4	214	34.3	193	30.9	13	2.1
Interest in Language/Linguistics	133	21.3	190	30.4	193	30.9	20	3.2
Other	30	4.8	7	1.1	31	5.0	10	1.6

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

The low ranking given to "family is of Japanese heritage" as a reason for studying Japanese suggests again that there are comparatively few students of Japanese heritage who are in Japanese programs or that these families are not encouraging their children to pursue the study of Japanese. As previously mentioned, this is in marked contrast with the number of students of Chinese and Korean descent who study these languages.

A check on the broad types of interest in Japan among the collegiate students shows, once again, business at the top of the list (32.5 percent), followed by culture (22.6 percent) and general interest (20.9 percent). (See Table 3.86.) Expectations of future employment are also predictably identified principally with business. Those who opted for business (304) numbered almost three times as many as those who listed the second choice, government (115). Close behind with 106 were those interested in science/technology. (See Table 3.87.)

Table 3.86: Most Important Focus of Interest in Japan among Students

Area of Interest	Number	Percent
Business	196	32.5
Technology	32	5.3
Aesthetics (art, literature, etc.)	68	11.3
Culture	136	22.6
General Interest	126	20.9
Curiosity	14	2.3
Other	31	5.1
Total	603	100.0
No Response = 21		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Table 3.87: Students' Expectations of Employment (N=624)

Vocation	Number[1]	Percent
Business	304	48.7
Government	115	18.4
Science/Technology	106	17.0
Law	72	11.5
College Teaching	94	15.1
Elementary School Teaching	24	3.8
Middle School Teaching	21	3.4
High School Teaching	58	9.3
Other	101	16.2
[1]Multiple answers possible		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

This recurring demonstration of instrumental motivation for studying Japanese again suggests the need to examine the curricula offered in most institutions. A desire to understand spoken Japanese and become fluent in the spoken language is matched in most programs by a single, traditional four-skills curriculum that puts increasingly heavy emphasis on reading and writing as the student increases in proficiency. There is even a question as to the amount of emphasis actually placed on the spoken language in first year courses. Much less time is spent on homework related to oral skills than on reading assignments and memorization of *kanji*. Third and fourth year courses show a marked drop in enrollment. To some extent, this is perhaps a reflection of the increasing lack of relevance to student interests. Business-related courses are offered only in the larger programs and are usually open only to students who have completed a number of courses in the regular curriculum.

Most native Japanese instructors cannot imagine not teaching—even concentrating—on the written language. After all, study of the written language consumed the major part of time in school they themselves spent on the Japanese language and that moved them to literacy—surely a requirement for an educated person. For native English-speaking teachers, their previous experience with Category 1 foreign languages, like French and Spanish, leads to an assumption that both speaking and reading skills should always be learned together, usually with a significant concentration on reading and a great deal of direct translation between the two languages. However, for a Category 4 language with an incredibly complex writing system, concentration on the spoken language would make a tremendous difference in the level of oral competence students could achieve. After all, mastery of the writing system is so time-consuming that most students drop out long before they are able to read any connected discourse except textbook materials, in spite of long hours spent learning *kanji*.

What is needed is a more imaginative and expanded approach to the curriculum of Japanese language classes, which takes into consideration the goals of most of the learners. Instead of offering only the traditional four years of all-skills courses, which devote significant amounts of time to reading and writing, why not add a second track for those interested in concentrating on spoken Japanese? *The* traditional curriculum should *by no means* be abandoned; it should be expanded. At the present time, students terminating Japanese study after only one or two years (the majority) have gained little; in most programs, students have little practical, usable proficiency in *any* skill when they have simply enrolled in the beginning stages of an all-skills curriculum developed for multiyear study. By concentrating on oral skills—apparently, the principal interest of the majority of students—a basic, but usable, oral competence could be developed, one that would actually expedite learning of the written language if interest were sufficiently sparked to encourage a later expansion of Japanese language study.

When teachers are hard working and enthusiastic, most language students tend to be pleased with their courses. It is only when they encounter a second program with different teachers, who may embrace a different philosophy and use a new methodology, that they begin to become more critical. As one student remarked after entering what he considered to be a particularly effective Japanese course, "I never realized how bad my other course was until I began this program." At one college, the students in a seminar on foreign language pedagogy observed classes in all the languages offered on their campus. With each visit, it became increasingly obvious that not all types of language teaching are equally effective for American students. The most successful program was quickly distinguishable from all the others. By vote of the seminar participants, it was the Japanese program, taught at that school as a unified program by a staff, every member of which was professionally trained.

Japanese programs, like all others, gain reputations on their campuses that are assumed to exert an important influence on prospective students. According to the student respondents, the most important aspects relating to Japanese are that it is a difficult language, that Japanese courses require hard work, and that they are time-consuming. There was strong agreement on the validity of the last two points, slightly less on the first. (One must remember that a significant number of the respondents are first-year students.) The less widespread reputation that the Japanese courses are well taught and that they are worth the effort had support as being valid, insofar as they had such a reputation. In contrast, the beliefs that good grades in Japanese courses are difficult to achieve and that Japanese language study is only for specialists were believed to be invalid. (See Table 3.88.) Surprisingly, there seemed to be little indication that the reputation of a good program served as the motivation for studying Japanese for students currently enrolled. It was one of the lowest ranking reasons given.

Table 3.88: Students' View of the Reputation and Validity of the Reputation of Their Program (N=624)

Descriptive Elements of Japanese Language Programs	Reputation		Validity of Reputation	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number[1]	Percent
Well Taught	350	56.1	435	69.7
Difficult Language to Learn	425	68.1	359	57.5
Difficult to Get a Good Grade	220	35.3	139	22.3
Time-Consuming	394	63.1	444	71.2
Only for Specialists	104	16.7	15	2.4
Worth the Effort	204	32.7	331	53.0
Requires Hard Work	398	63.8	456	73.1

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Only 18 percent of the student respondents (111 in number) receive financial assistance to support their study of Japanese. Most of that support (57.7 percent) comes from the college or university. There were a few cases noted of direct support from an area studies department or a Japanese language department. (See Table 3.89.)

Table 3.89: Students' Sources of Financial Assistance (N=111)

Sources	Number[1]	Percent
University/College	64	57.7
Area Studies Program	4	3.6
Department Offering Japanese Language	3	2.7
Other	48	43.2

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Very few of the student respondents have ever been discouraged from taking Japanese by their advisors. Insofar as any such negative advice was given, it was most apt to be on the grounds that the course was too time-consuming or too difficult. (See Table 3.90.)

Table 3.90: Reasons Students are Advised Against Studying Japanese (N=624)

Reasons	Number[1]	Percent
Course Difficulty	26	4.2
Scheduling Problems	16	2.6
Irrelevance to Rest of Study Plans	20	3.2
Deficiencies in the Japanese Program	10	1.6
Too Time-Consuming	35	5.6
Other	13	2.1

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Employing the same scale of 1-7 used for teacher respondents (see page 82), student respondents were asked to rate their current facility in Japanese. The largest group of student respondents placed themselves at the survival level (level 2) in speaking (28.7 percent) and listening (28.2 percent), but beyond survival (level 3) in reading (28.1 percent) and writing (29.3 percent). One must assume that these ratings are unrealistically high because most of the respondents are in first-year courses. Even more surprising are the significantly large numbers who appraise their current ability at levels 4 and 5, which represent extremely high levels of proficiency. It would seem that there is not a clear understanding of the requirements for these levels, nor a realization of the breadth of competence of a native speaker. (See Table 3.91.)

Table 3.91: Self-Evaluation of Current Japanese Language Skills by Students

	Speaking	**Listening**	**Reading**	**Writing**
Ability Level	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
1 - No Usable Skill	2.0	4.1	9.0	6.5
2 - Survival Level	28.7	28.2	24.3	27.6
3 - Beyond Survival, but Limited	24.8	21.9	28.1	29.3
4 - Occupational and Social Use, but with Serious Limitations	22.7	18.9	22.1	24.1
5 - Occupational and Social Use, with Only Some Limitations	18.5	21.9	15.4	11.9
6 - Occupational and Social Use, at the Near-Native Level	2.7	4.5	0.8	0.5
7 - Equivalent to Native Speaker	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.0
Totals	100.0 (N=600)	100.0 (N=603)	100.0 (N=597)	100.0 (N=597)
Mean values	3.38	3.42	3.14	3.09

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

This is equally true of the teacher respondents in answering a question as to the percentage of their students currently at each level of proficiency. For current ability, the mean assessment puts at least a few students in every category, including native proficiency. For each skill, the largest group of students is at the "survival" level, and this decreases gradually up to the level of "native" speaker. In reading, the mean percentage of 13.38 percent includes students at the level of native speaker, and at least one teacher placed one-half of his students there. One can only wonder at the interpretation being given to the category "native proficiency." (See Table 3.92.)

Table 3.92: Japanese Teachers' Judgment of Percentage of Students in Each Skill Category (N=131)

Ability Level	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
	Mean Percentage of Students	Mean Percentage of Students	Mean Percentage of Students	Mean Percentage of Students
No Usable Skill	19.78	19.93	42.90	42.35
Survival Level	44.82	45.95	41.40	41.99
Beyond Survival, but Limited	32.13	32.91	29.62	27.57
Able to Use the Language Occupationally and Socially, but with Serious Limitations	25.34	27.92	26.79	28.52
Able to Use the Language Occupationally and Socially, but with Some Limitations	22.13	22.30	21.73	17.88
Able to Use the Language Occupationally and Socially at the Near-Native Level	12.70	13.56	15.00	10.84
Ability Equivalent to that of a Native Speaker	8.50	8.55	13.38	8.71

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

This issue becomes even more serious when one focuses on the students' predictions of their proficiency upon leaving their current institutions. For each skill, the largest number have now moved to level 5, which represents a competence that usually requires several thousands of hours of instruction. Even more surprising is the number who predict they will be level 6, the near-native level. It is extremely doubtful that large numbers of students can possibly reach these levels on the basis of only a few part-time courses in college. (See Table 3.93.)

Table 3.93: Students' Expectation of Level of Proficiency upon Leaving Institution

Ability Level	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1 - No Usable Skill	0.5	0.5	1.8	1.7
2 - Survival Level	7.4	7.5	7.2	9.1
3 - Beyond Survival, but Limited	10.9	9.2	12.1	11.4
4 - Occupational and Social Use, but with Serious Limitations	16.4	16.9	18.1	21.0
5 - Occupational and Social Use, with Only Some Limitations	38.3	36.7	36.3	34.3
6 - Occupational and Social Use, at the Near-Native Level	23.2	24.6	20.3	20.0
7 - Equivalent to Native Speaker	3.4	4.5	4.2	2.4
Totals	100.0 (N=596)	100.0 (N=597)	100.0 (N=597)	100.0 (N=595)
Mean values	4.67	4.74	4.57	4.47

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Ultimately, the majority of these respondents expect to be at the near-native level, with an amazing number believing they will be at the level of competence of a native speaker. One can only wonder, again, if they have pondered what a native speaker's competence entails—its breadth, its linguistic and pragmatic accuracy, its control of knowledge that must be assumed to be shared with other native speakers, and its familiarity with acquired culture. For the Japanese language, one must also mention the native speaker's broad knowledge of onomatopoeia, a special challenge rarely met by nonnatives. Once again, it is important to remember how little linguistic and cultural orientation students are receiving when they embark on the study of a foreign language. This has a continuing negative effect on all aspects of their language study, including their general understanding of levels of competence. (See Table 3.94.)

Table 3.94: Ultimate Level of Proficiency Students Expect to Attain

Ability level	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1 - No Usable Skill	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.8
2 - Survival Level	1.3	2.0	1.8	2.6
3 - Beyond Survival, but Limited	3.8	2.4	2.6	3.0
4 - Occupational and Social Use, but with Serious Limitations	5.1	5.5	7.5	8.2
5 - Occupational and Social Use, with Only Some Limitations	19.0	17.8	23.0	25.2
6 - Occupational and Social Use, at the Near-Native Level	41.1	39.0	37.2	37.2
7 - Equivalent to Native Speaker	29.3	32.8	26.7	22.9
Totals	100.0 (N=611)	100.0 (N=613)	100.0 (N=610)	100.0 (N=607)
Mean values	5.81	5.86	5.68	5.58

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

A similar problem of inflated self-appraisal has occurred in all categories of the survey. Both teachers and students in both pre-collegiate and postsecondary programs are overestimating students' (and at least some nonnative teachers') competence. Requirements for the upper levels extend to a broad range of ability covering a wide variety of situations, with the topmost level that of a true native speaker. To assign students (or any nonnative speakers) to that level is to claim that they are truly proficient, not simply that they are remarkably good considering the fact that they are not Japanese. What is needed is increased evaluation by objective tests and certified examiners.

The student respondents predictions regarding the length of time necessary for them to reach these advanced levels of competence range principally from 1 to 2 more years (18.9 percent) to 3 to 4 more years (35.9 percent) to 5 years or more (37.9 percent). The number planning to spend 5 or more years studying Japanese are fewer than those who expect to reach near-native or native proficiency. Even if one were to accept the notion that length of study alone determines the possibility of achieving these levels, too few respondents have allowed for a sufficient period of time. (See Table 3.95.)

Table 3.95: Expected Time Needed by Students to Achieve Advanced Levels of Competence in Japanese

Time Period	Number	Percent
No Particular Goal Established	29	4.7
Less than 1 More Year	16	2.6
1-2 More Years	117	18.9
3-4 More Years	222	35.9
5 Years or More	234	37.9
Total	618	100.0
No Response = 6		

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

Continuation of Japanese study at their current institution is planned by a solid majority of the students (81 percent) who replied to this question, for at least one (39 percent) or two (34 percent) more years. A sizable number (63 percent) will follow this up with study at another institution. Almost all (93 percent) plan to continue Japanese study on their own. This last choice is a worthwhile intention that can be productive under a carefully worked-out self-study program. However, such programs tend to be less productive at very advanced levels, when professional guidance and critiquing are required if significant progress is to be made. These enthusiastic plans for continuation of Japanese study beyond elementary levels are in marked contrast to attrition patterns that have previously existed. It is important to follow the actual enrollments in advanced classes to check the accuracy of current student intentions.

The predictions of the program administrators are somewhat different: For students currently enrolled in first-year Japanese courses, these administrators foresee a steadily diminishing period of continuing study, from a mean percentage of 47.12 percent who will go on for less that 1 year to 4.74 percent for more than 4 years. These figures indicate a general expectation of a high dropout rate for students who have just begun their study of Japanese. This steady decrease is also expected for students currently in their second year of study, with one interesting exception: The prediction of students who will study for more than four more years shows an increase of almost 7 percent from the previous category, to reach 15.38 percent. This suggests that by the time students reach second year, those who are serious about their Japanese language studies become easier to identify. In both sets of predictions, the percentage expected to continue for two more years has already decreased to the twenties. The figures for those currently in third year look very different indeed: The greatest percentages are assigned to those expected to terminate after the current year and after one more year and to those expected to continue for more than four more years. Remembering that the enrollments in third year are already extremely low, compared to those in the initial years, it is not surprising that a significant percentage of those in third year may indeed be planning to specialize in the Japanese language. Another interesting feature of this set of predictions is that a greater percentage of third-year students will continue for one more year than will terminate after the current year. This points to a group who plan to take Japanese throughout their four-year college course of study, but not beyond. (See Table 3.96.)

Table 3.96: Mean Percentage of Students at Various Levels Expected to Continue Study (N=148)

	Elementary	**Intermediate**	**Advanced**
Length of Continued Study	**Mean Percentage**	**Mean Percentage**	**Mean Percentage**
Less than 1 More Year	47.12	54.60	44.38
1 More Year	41.22	39.35	48.61
2 More Years	21.06	24.18	35.33
3 More Years	18.38	19.00	25.63
4 More Years	10.95	8.62	7.25
More than 4 Years	4.74	15.38	44.33

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

The reason students give up the study of Japanese is attributed to many causes, according to the program directors. Leading their list by a significant margin is the general difficulty of the language, the principal reason suggested at the pre-collegiate level as well. Other principal reasons relate to time: Students complain about the amount of time required to prepare for class, a general lack of time, and the amount of time required to reach useful proficiency. Reasons cited a bit less frequently are schedule conflicts, lack of dedication, and the difficulty of the writing system. (See Table 3.97.)

Table 3.97: General Reasons Offered by Program Directors for Attrition (N=148)

General Reasons	Checked		Most Important	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number	Percent
Difficulty of the Language in General	76	51.3	28	18.9
Difficulty of the Writing System	63	42.6	11	7.4
Inadequate Teaching Materials	13	8.8	1	0.7
Unsuccessful Teaching Methods	10	6.8	1	0.7
Schedule Conflict	68	45.9	13	8.8
Lack of Time	70	47.3	20	13.5
Lack of Interest	27	18.2	6	4.1
Lack of Dedication	56	37.8	13	8.8
Lack of Support from the School (advisor, department, etc.)	17	11.5	4	2.7
Limited Career Utility	19	12.8	2	1.4
Too Much Time Required to Prepare for Class	68	45.9	24	16.2
Too Much Time Required to Reach Useful Proficiency	66	44.6	21	14.2
No Further Courses at Higher Level	5	3.4	2	1.4
Completed Language Requirement	0	0.0	4	2.7
No Major/Minor in Japanese	1	0.7	1	0.7
Transfer to Another Institution	1	0.7	1	0.7
Other	17	11.5	1	0.7

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary General Administrators' Survey

The teachers' assessments of the reasons students give up the study of Japanese generally coincide with those already mentioned: The difficulty of the language ranks first, followed by the time required for preparation, a general lack of time, and the time it takes to reach useful proficiency. (See Table 3.98.)

Table 3.98: General Reasons Offered by Teachers for Attrition (N=131)

General Reasons	Checked		Most Important	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number	Percent
Difficulty of the Language in General	69	52.7	27	20.6
Difficulty of the Writing System	60	45.8	9	6.9
Inadequate Teaching Materials	14	10.7	2	1.5
Unsuccessful Teaching Methods	13	9.9	2	1.5
Schedule Conflict	72	55.0	6	4.6
Lack of Time	79	60.3	16	12.2
Lack of Interest	36	27.5	7	5.3
Lack of Dedication	63	48.1	7	5.3
Lack of Support from the School (advisor, department, etc.)	22	16.8	1	0.8
Limited Career Utility	20	15.3	3	2.3
Too Much Time Required to Prepare for Class	62	47.3	25	19.1
Too Much Time Required to Reach Useful Proficiency	67	51.1	15	11.5
Other	5	3.8	4	3.1

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Teachers' Survey

Reasons supplied by the students for not continuing the study of Japanese are mixed, with few reasons emerging stronger than others as was the case when program directors and teachers were asked the same question about their students. Leaving school seems to be the principal reason, indicating a widespread expectation among students not to terminate their training. Beyond that, lack of dedication, too much time required to reach useful proficiency, and too much time required for class preparation, and schedule conflict had a few more votes than other choices. It is interesting to note that the students themselves do not single out the difficulty of the language as particularly significant: This is the judgment of the program directors and the teachers. Students consider the reputation of the difficulty of Japanese courses to be of only limited validity. (See Table 3.99.)

Table 3.99: General Reasons Offered by Students for Attrition (N=624)

General Reasons	Checked		Most Important	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number	Percent
Leaving School	14	2.2	17	2.7
Difficulty of the Language in General	10	1.6	1	0.2
Difficulty of the Writing System	5	0.8	0	0.0
Inadequate Teaching Materials	1	0.2	0	0.0
Unsuccessful Teaching Methods	7	1.1	1	0.2
Poor Teaching	4	0.6	1	0.2
Schedule Conflict	8	1.3	5	0.8
Lack of Interest	7	1.1	0	0.0
Lack of Dedication	17	2.7	2	0.3
Lack of Support from the School Advisor, Department, etc.)	8	1.3	0	0.0
Limited Career Utility	7	1.1	1	0.2
Too Much Time Required to Prepare for Class	12	1.9	0	0.0
Too Much Time Required to Reach Useful Proficiency	16	2.6	2	0.3
Poor Grades	9	1.4	1	0.2
Other	13	2.1	1	0.2

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

In spite of the predictions of unrealistically high levels of proficiency, the time required to achieve useful proficiency appears as a basis for dropping Japanese study. One can assume that some students, already in college and still at a low level of competence, are beginning to realize the length of time needed to reach a point at which the language can really be used professionally. In other words, although the majority may believe that near-native and native proficiency lie ahead, there are those whose judgment is more tempered, to the point at which they are abandoning their study of the language.

In listing the most important gains they derived from their study of Japanese, leading the students' list was a skill they were anxious to develop—an ability to speak the language. Again, the question must be raised as to the level of speaking competence that has been achieved: Have these students learned to speak *fluently*? In view of their inflated self-appraisal ratings, it is doubtful that they really understand what "speaking fluently" entails. (See Table 3.100.)

Table 3.100: Skills Gained by Students through Japanese Language Instruction (N=624)

General Reasons	Checked		Most Important	
	Number[1]	Percent	Number	Percent
Knowledge about Japan	423	67.8	53	8.5
Knowledge of a Different Culture	389	62.3	43	6.9
Ability in Speaking Japanese	364	58.3	169	27.1
Ability in Understanding Spoken Japanese	441	70.7	89	14.3
Ability in Reading Japanese	440	70.5	103	16.5
Ability in Writing Japanese	488	78.2	49	7.9
Japanese Friends	244	39.1	7	1.1
Intellectual Exercise	336	53.8	22	3.5
Satisfied a Requirement	230	36.9	18	2.9
Other	27	4.3	9	1.4

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Postsecondary Students' Survey

An ability to read was felt to be a most important gain achieved by more students than competence in understanding spoken Japanese—a reversal of the order in their reasons for studying. Again, it would be useful to know *what* they are able to read and their degree of facility with the language. Writing ability consistently comes out at the bottom of the skills, both as a goal and as a gain.

It is useful to return to the discussion raised at the very beginning of this report. What does it mean to say one can speak or read or understand or write Japanese? What does it mean to "know" Japanese? The student with an elementary level of competence is just as apt to claim to be as competent as the most proficient learner. Even the judgments of teachers show little consistency. Although these claims will probably never change, nor is it likely that a vocabulary in daily usage will be developed that accurately distinguishes different levels of proficiency, it would be useful to have a widely recognized metric that provided teachers with reasonable expectations and informed students about their level of accomplishment. As programs around the country were examined, programs were found that raced through material at a speed that permitted no internalization of the material covered, and others, even at the college level, that were teaching the equivalent of "la plume de ma tante."

A great part of America's strength lies in its emphasis on individuality and its freedom from confining, standardized regulation. At the same time, when standards are totally lacking and many of the language teachers are untrained in language pedagogy, the availability of general curricular guidelines and objective standardized exams can be extremely helpful. Parallel to the curriculum and testing being prepared for high schools, a similar program would also serve as a great benefit to some colleges, particularly those with small, new programs and/or teachers without specialized training. What is more, if large numbers of high schools adopt the new pre-collegiate curricular guidelines, it will be important for colleges to develop their own curricula in a way that accommodates graduates of those programs. There is no question that starting again from the beginning will always be necessary for some high school graduates. The issue is the means by which those moving from a superior pre-collegiate program to college study of Japanese will be integrated. Articulation will never be achieved, no matter how similar and improved the products of the high schools become, if the colleges continue the extreme diversity that now exists. For example, the assumption is that beginning college courses emphasize speaking—and this is reflected in the survey's mean scores. But that average score subsumes, at one extreme, programs that place heavy emphasis on speaking, and numerous others that clearly focus on reading and writing from the first day, at the other extreme. For every mean, there are countless extremes. What is more, there is evidence in the types of examinations that teachers administer and the allocation of students' study time that emphasis on oral skills may be generally less than one might expect.

The overall Japanese college curriculum needs a new look, developed with professionalism and imagination and a willingness to try something thus far untried. Also needed are research projects that study the methodologies most effective for American students. There are too many teachers whose answer to "why" questions about what and how they teach is simply "I've always done it this way." Much of this vast new student body has new goals. If the principal result of the "Japanese boom" is to be more than comparatively few graduates with advanced competence, dramatic action should be taken.

Endnotes

1. Bettina J. Huber, "Foreign Language Programs in the United States: Characteristics of the Programs and the Institutions Housing Them," draft (New York: Modern Language Association, 1989); 1990 MLA Data Base.
2. Barron's Educational Services, Inc., *Profiles of American Colleges* (New York: Barron's Educational Services, Inc., 1986).
3. Ibid., xxii-xxx.
4. "Programs Offering Japanese," MLA 1990 Data Base (New York: Modern Language Association, 1990).
5. The respondents to the postsecondary teachers survey number 131, representing 48 different institutions—from two-year junior colleges (5 percent) to PhD-granting universities (71 percent) and from noncompetitive (7 percent) to most competitive (34 percent). The majority (61 percent) teach at public institutions, 53 percent of which have enrollments of 15,000 or more.
6. Fully 51 percent of postsecondary teachers surveyed belong to the Association of Teachers of Japanese.

FOUR

Falcon Program

With the growing interest in developing means by which students of Japanese can be brought to higher levels of proficiency as quickly as possible, it was only natural that full-time intensive instruction would be considered. All of the programs described earlier fit Japanese language instruction into academic programs whose primary focus is nonlinguistic. There are, of course, summer language program in which the entire curriculum is devoted to the study of Japanese, but even these tend to fit into academic year part-time programs.

One of the major policy questions is whether such part-time study is the most effective way of studying a Category 4 language or, for that matter, any language. One way in which Japanese language learning as a full-time enterprise is accomplished is in programs carried out in Japan itself. In the near future, the National Foreign Language Center will be surveying such programs. However, even in this review of U.S.-based programs, there is one program in which, for a full year, all student effort is directed toward learning Japanese—the Full-year Asian Language Concentration (FALCON) program at Cornell University. Because of the importance of this policy issue, a survey was conducted relating to this program. Of particular interest was the retrospective view of the program by graduates and an examination of the subsequent careers and use of Japanese in the years after graduation.

In 1972, the FALCON program was established at Cornell University, originally as part of a one-year experiment to determine whether full year, full-time intensive language programs could be conducted as regular college/university offerings. Now in its twentieth year, Japanese FALCON continues with ever-increasing numbers of applicants and enrollments, although it is still a program in which students, deliberately limited to a small number, receive highly individualized attention and the student to teacher ratio is kept extremely low. Surprisingly, it is still the only program of its kind in the entire United States, outside of the government and military. FALCON students are a mixture: undergraduates and graduate students in the midst of degree programs, nondegree postgraduate and postdoctoral students, business executives, lawyers, engineers, missionaries, journalists, and architects, among others. While enrolled in FALCON, they discontinue all other activities as they spend one calendar year totally committed to the study of the Japanese language. Graduates of the first 17 classes were surveyed to determine their subsequent reactions to the program and their activities following graduation. A majority of the 165 graduates of those classes were located, and 101 survey responses were received. The high percentage of returns is an indication that FALCON produces a strong bonding and loyalty among its participants.

The self-selectivity of Japanese students, noted in all the categories covered thus far, also applies to FALCON students. Of the 101 respondents, 54 percent hold graduate degrees, and 61.5 percent of them hold degrees from institutions ranked as "most competitive." (See Table 4.1.) At the present time, 28 FALCON graduates are continuing their studies, the majority (24 or 86 percent) in degree programs: The largest number are studying for the PhD degree, and the next largest group is working toward an MA. (See Table 4.2.) Asian Studies is attracting the largest number as a specialization, with business and linguistics the next most popular majors. It is probably safe to assume that at least some of the Asian Studies specialists will also be heading for the business world. (See Table 4.3.)

Table 4.1: Distribution of FALCON Students with Graduate Degrees by Selectivity of Conferring Institutions

Selectivity	Number	Percent
Special	2	3.8
Noncompetitive	1	1.9
Competitive	4	7.7
Very Competitive	8	15.4
Highly Competitive	3	5.8
Most Competitive	32	61.5
Other	2	3.8
Total	52	100.0
No Response = 49		

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Table 4.2: Degree Programs in Which FALCON Alumni Are Enrolled

	Number	Percent
Not Enrolled	73	72.2
Degree Program		
BA/BS	4	4.0
MA	6	5.9
MBA	3	3.0
LLD/JD	1	1.0
PhD	8	7.9
Joint Degree	2	2.0
Other	3	3.0
No Response	1	1.0
Total	101	100.0

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Table 4.3: Major Subjects of FALCON Alumni Who Are Currently Students

	Number	Percent
Not Enrolled	73	72.2
Major Subject		
Asian Studies	6	5.9
Linguistics	3	3.0
Japanese	2	2.0
Japanese Literature	2	2.0
TESOL/FL	1	1.0
East Asian History	1	1.0
Anthropology	1	1.0
International Relations	1	1.0
Joint MBA/Asian Studies	2	2.0
Physics	1	1.0
Business	3	3.0
Education	1	1.0
Engineering	1	1.0
Law	1	1.0
Other	2	2.0
Total	101	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding.
Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

In spite of the grueling nature of the program, the graduates were enthusiastic in their approval: Only three would not enroll again. A solid majority (84) of the 101 respondents would definitely enroll (some marked their votes with exclamation points), and 13 said "perhaps." In comparing FALCON with traditional language courses, 90 percent found it more effective.

One can assume that students willing to devote an entire year to concentrated Japanese language learning, uninterrupted by other activities of any kind, are seriously committed to Japanese. This survey, focused on the subsequent pursuits of the graduates of this intensive program. Of the 73 who are not students at present, 50 are currently in the United States, 22 in Japan, and 1 in Europe. (See Table 4.4.) Of the group who are not currently students, 69 describe themselves as currently employed. The largest number of respondents among this group currently employed work for American employers in the United States (22), Japanese employers in Japan (16), or are self-employed/in their own firms (16). American firms in Japan, which one might expect to be interested in American employees with Japanese language competence, number only four among employers of FALCON graduates. (See Table 4.5.)

Table 4.4: Current Address of FALCON Alumni (Not Currently Students)

Location	Number	Percent
United States	50	68.5
Europe	1	1.4
Japan	22	30.1
Total	73	100.0

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Table 4.5: General Categorization of Companies Currently Employing FALCON Alumni

Employer Type	Number	Percent
American Employer in Japan	4	5.8
Japanese Employer in Japan	16	23.2
American Employer in the United States	22	31.9
Japanese Employer in the United States	2	2.9
Own Firm/Self-Employed	16	23.2
Other	9	13.0
Total	69	100.0

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

The American employers of this group of currently employed FALCON graduates are scattered throughout the United States, with most in New York and California. (See Table 4.6.) The organizations for which the currently employed FALCON graduates work represent a wide variety of fields, with the largest number concentrated in communication, education, law, and government (including Japanese government education programs). If manufacturing and finance are combined with business, this business-related group employs the greatest percentage of FALCON graduates. (See Table 4.7.) They work as teachers/professors, lawyers, and managers, but again the variety is so extensive that each type of employment is apt to be represented by only one or two individuals. (See Table 4.8.)

Table 4.6: Location of Current Employers of FALCON Alumni

Location	Number	Percent
United States		
California	8	11.6
District of Columbia	2	2.9
Georgia	1	1.4
Florida	1	1.4
Illinois	1	1.4
Kentucky	1	1.4
Maryland	1	1.4
Massachusetts	4	5.8
Minnesota	1	1.4
New Jersey	1	1.4
New York	17	24.6
Oregon	1	1.4
Pennsylvania	2	2.9
Virginia	1	1.4
Washington	1	1.4
Europe		
United Kingdom	1	1.4
Japan	25	36.2
Total	69	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding.
Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Table 4.7: Types of Employer Fields in Which FALCON Alumni Are Currently Employed

Employer Field	Number	Percent
Manufacturing	7	10.3
Business	6	8.8
Finance/Banking	6	8.8
Government (including JET)	6	8.8
Education (general)	5	7.4
College	9	13.2
Communications (miscellaneous)	10	14.7
Foundation/Research	3	4.4
Missionary	2	2.9
Law	5	7.4
Architecture	1	1.5
Consulting	5	7.4
Service	1	1.5
Other	2	2.9
Total	68	100.0
No Response = 1		

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Table 4.8: General Job Description of FALCON Alumni (Currently Employed)

Job Description	Number	Percent
Company Owner	2	2.9
Analyst	5	7.2
Manager	7	10.1
Officer	3	4.3
Coordinator	3	4.3
Representative	1	1.4
Teacher	4	5.8
Lawyer	6	8.8
Accountant	1	1.4
Consultant	1	1.4
Engineer	1	1.4
Literary	2	3.0
Translating	3	4.3
Sales	2	2.9
Teaching Japanese	2	2.9
Teaching English	9	13.0
Other	17	24.6
Total	69	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding.
Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Of this group, almost one-half described Japanese as essential for anyone preparing for a job like theirs. Specifically, in finding their first job, 39.1 percent found it important or very important to know Japanese, and 55.1 percent gave it the same rating in connection with their current employment. (See Table 4.9.) It is interesting to note that even American students with both foreign language competence and international MBAs tend to report that their language skills play a limited role in securing employment. Among the graduates of three leading international MBA programs, 32.2 percent indicated that their foreign language competence was either a handicap or irrelevant in securing their current job, and 41.0 percent in finding their first job.[1] Clearly, a knowledge of Japanese is a comparative advantage in the job market, even without an MBA. However, the U.S. business community has yet to learn the means of utilizing this scarce language competence.

Table 4.9: FALCON Alumni (Currently Employed) Rating of the Importance of Japanese Language Competency in Securing Employment

	Importance for Current Job		Importance for First Job	
Degree of Importance	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Irrelevant	18	26.1	12	17.4
Helped Somewhat	10	14.5	9	13.0
Important	10	14.5	9	13.0
Very Important	28	40.6	18	26.1
No Response	3	4.3	21	30.4
Total	69	100.0	69	100.0

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

Even in cases in which their daily job-related responsibilities do not require Japanese to any significant degree, the respondents indicated extensive continuing use of the language for everything from social conversation to travel and daily living. (See Table 4.10.)

Table 4.10: Extent that Currently Employed FALCON Alumni Use Japanese in Various Situations (N=69)

Situations	**Mean Frequency of Use**[1]
Social Conversations	3.56
Watching Television and/or Movies; Listening to the Radio	3.37
Travel	3.30
Professional Conversations	3.29
Work-related Telephoning	3.12
Daily Living Requirements	2.93
Participation in Meetings	2.90
Interpreting	2.78
Attending Lectures/Oral Presentations	2.74
Reading Office Memos/Correspondence	2.62
Reading Newspapers and Periodicals	2.61
Translating	2.57
Reading Reports/Documents	2.49
Writing Personal Letters	2.31
Lecturing/Giving Oral Presentations	2.28
Conversation with Family Members	2.15
Reading Books (nonfiction)	2.04
Writing Office Memos/Correspondence	1.94
Reading Books (fiction)	1.83
Writing Articles and/or Books	1.36

[1] FALCON graduates were asked to evaluate their use of Japanese in each area based on the following scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Constantly

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

The FALCON graduates' self-appraisal ratings for their competence at the conclusion of the program include a few extremes, but the mean scores reflect levels of proficiency within the range normally expected after one year of full-time study, when the requirements of the levels are interpreted according to their original intent. What is particularly significant is the degree to which these former students (73 in number) have continued their serious study of the language, with the attendant result that they are continuing to improve their proficiency in all domains. (See Table 4.11.) In other words, whether or not their individual absolute numerical self-ratings are accurate, they do know that they are more proficient now than when they ended FALCON. An added benefit of their year of intensive study is their apparent continuing serious interest and useful knowledge of the way to study a language effectively, even on their own.

Table 4.11: Self-Evaluation of Japanese Proficiency in Various Skills by FALCON Alumni (Not Currently Students) at the Conclusion of FALCON and at Present (mean values) (N=73)

Skill Areas	At Conclusion of FALCON	At Present
	Mean Proficiency[1]	Mean Proficiency[1]
Speaking	3.69	4.25
Listening	3.79	4.44
Reading	2.61	3.27
Writing	2.38	2.54

[1] FALCON graduates were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 0 to 7 in which 0 = "nonexistent," 4 = "able to use Japanese professionally and socially, but with definite limitations," and 7 = "ability almost to that of a native speaker."

Source: FALCON Graduate Survey

The question that must be asked is why, after 20 years of successful operation, at a time when there is greater interest in Japanese language study than ever before, FALCON continues to be the only intensive program of its kind. The answer seems to lie in the freedom from ordinary university regulations and constraints with which, of necessity, it has been permitted to operate. It has its own budget; it is taught with a customized curriculum, adjusted to each year's learners as the year progresses; the drill classes are kept very small—usually seven or eight students at the most; the entire staff is professionally trained and works as an independent, unified team, guided by a program director; and, above all, the instruction is labor-intensive—requiring a staff willing to exert maximum effort to help each individual achieve his/her fullest potential. One thing is clear: One 30-hour-per-week course is qualitatively different from a sequence of 6 5-hour-per-week courses, in terms of both the administrative and instructional requirements and the product. Obviously, there are few institutions willing or able—or inclined—to undertake the task.

Endnotes

1. See Richard D. Lambert, "Foreign Language Use Among International Business Graduates," *Foreign Language and the Workplace*, Richard D. Lambert and Sarah J. Moore, eds., *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 511 (September 1990): 54-55.

FIVE

Non-traditional Learning Environments

With the growing interest in the study of Japanese, there is increasing demand for offerings in addition to the traditional first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year all-skills courses. There is more interest in courses on Japanese for business purposes, for scientists and engineers, and for hotel personnel, among others. Some postsecondary programs have multiple tracks—offering one curriculum that emphasizes oral skills and another the written language. With the increase in alumni of high school courses entering college, transition courses may be in growing demand in postsecondary programs in which there has been little accomodation except for making those students return to the very beginning level. Another need is for courses that focus on the requirements of those who have spent time in Japan, who have had no formal study, but rather simply "picked up the language" without having the vaguest notion about what they were acquiring. Remedial training for such speakers, identifiable by their "abominable fluency," is poorly handled in classes of true beginners. In ever-greater numbers, colleges are offering intensive summer programs aimed at covering an academic year's work in Japanese in an eight- or nine-week session. The summer program may emphasize a particular variety of Japanese. As an example, there is a program for scientists and engineers, with acceptance by examination, offered at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) with support from the National Science Foundation (NSF).

There are even programs that do not follow the traditional with-a-teacher-in-a-classroom format. Distance learning programs, with instruction for secondary schools handled by satellite and made available to large numbers of schools spread over a wide geographic area, is attracting considerable interest in some circles. These data show that at least 288 schools receive Japanese language instruction in this manner through programs at the University of Alabama and the Satellite Educational Resources Consortium (SERC) based in Nebraska. Satellite Telecommunications Educational Programming (STEP), based in Washington, provides instruction via distance learning to at least 57 schools, and an unknown number of schools are served through Texas Interactive Institutional Network (TI-IN) and other local programs. The National Foreign Language Center will be examining these programs as part of a larger inquiry into foreign language instruction through distance learning. Such programs usually gather groups of learners into classrooms in a number of schools, and students in these classes proceed at the same pace.

In "individualized instruction," postsecondary students proceed on their own, at their own pace, using specialized materials with accompanying tapes, and working with an instructor on a tutorial basis according to need. They proceed to a more advanced lesson only after they have been tested and successfully pass exams based on the material covered. A recent addition to this type of instruction is the availability of guidance and answers to individual questions by telephone. Such an approach has a special appeal for part-time students who are employed and unable to enroll in a regularly scheduled course. They are able to proceed at their own rate, with no requirement to attend classes at fixed times.

It is also possible for colleges that have not established regular programs in Japanese to make study of the language available on their campuses under the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), one of the oldest nontraditional language teaching organizations in the United States. With membership in about 125 colleges (and a few high schools) throughout the United States, NASILP promotes instruction in a number of the less commonly taught languages, with Japanese among the most popular. NASILP programs are usually established when there are only a few students interested in studying a particular language. Frequently, however, they are the forerunners of regular programs that will be established if sufficient interest develops. With a textbook, accompanying tapes (audio and/or video), and a tutor (a native speaker who is *not* a trained teacher), students study a foreign language largely by listening to tapes, but also through a limited amount of drill practice in a classroom situation with the tutor. Credit and grades for the course are determined by individual examinations given by regular professors/teachers of the language, who are brought in from a college/university that has a regular program in that language. The organization, with headquarters at Temple University in Philadelphia, offers guidance to member schools and holds annual meetings for program administrators and examiners.

To determine the effectiveness of this dispersed instructional strategy, a brief survey instrument, prepared specially for NASILP students, was distributed among NASILP programs. Responses were received from 45 students located at 9 member schools, the largest number from Drexel University, which has a comparatively large program. First, who were the students, and how do they compare to the general population of students studying Japanese? The NASILP respondent population was surprisingly similar to the general postsecondary group: Slightly more students were male than female (53.3 percent to 46.7 percent), the largest group was between 21 and 23 years of age (37.8 percent), and the majority are full-time students (75.6 percent) in degree programs (73.3 percent). Most were undergraduates, but there were also a few graduate students and two high school students. (See Table 5.1.)

Table 5.1: Degree Program in Which NASILP Students Are Enrolled

Degree Level	Number	Percent
BA/BS	34	75.6
MA/MBA	3	6.7
Law	0	0.0
PhD	2	4.4
High School	2	4.4
No Response	4	8.9
Total	45	100.0

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

The percentage of native speakers of English was slightly less (73 percent) than that of the general student group, and the percentage of students whose parents used a language other than English at home was slightly greater (78 percent). (See Tables 5.2 and 5.3.) All but three had studied another foreign language, with French and Spanish the most common. The other languages studied included not only those considered typical in American postsecondary institutions—that is, German, Latin, and Russian—but also Greek, Hebrew, Malay, and Urdu. (See Table 5.4.) Of course, the numbers were minimal, given the total sample number, but these are languages that have been less likely to appear at all among students of Japanese. NASILP students seem to be foreign-language-oriented.

Table 5.2: Native Language of NASILP Students

Native Language	Number	Percent
English	33	73.3
Japanese	0	0.0
Other Asian Language		
Chinese	4	8.9
Korean	2	4.4
Vietnamese	2	4.4
Malay	1	2.2
Lao	1	2.2
Other European Language		
French	1	2.2
No Response	1	2.4
Total	45	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly to 100.0 due to rounding.
Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Table 5.3: Language(s) Used at Home by Parents of NASILP Students (N=45)

Native Language	Number[1]	Percent
English	35	77.8
Japanese	1	2.2
Other Asian language		
Chinese	4	8.9
Vietnamese	2	4.4
Korean	2	4.4
Lao	1	2.2
Other European language		
French	1	2.2
Spanish	1	2.2

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Table 5.4: Other Language(s) Studied by NASILP Students (N=45)

Language(s)	Number[1]	Percent
French	22	48.9
Spanish	21	46.7
Latin	8	17.8
Chinese	6	13.3
German	3	6.7
Italian	3	6.7
Greek	2	4.4
Hebrew	2	4.4
Korean	2	4.4
Russian	1	2.2
Other	2	4.4

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Experience in NASILP ranged from one to three semesters for 87 percent of the respondents, and 78 percent planned to continue—16 percent for one more term, 38 percent for two more terms, and 47 percent for three or more terms. (See Tables 5.5 and 5.6.)

Table 5.5: Number of Terms Students Have Studied Japanese Through Self-Instructional Programs

Number of terms	Number	Percent
1	16	35.6
2	11	24.4
3	12	26.7
4	2	4.4
5	1	2.2
6	2	4.4
No Response	1	2.3
Total	45	100.0

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Table 5.6: Students' Planned Length of Continued Study of Japanese Through Self-Instruction Programs

Number of terms	Number	Percent
1	5	15.6
2	12	37.5
3 or more	15	46.9
Total	32	100.0
No Response = 13		

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Traditionally, most NASILP programs have covered only the first two years of instruction, but an increasing number are extending the course to three years.

The principal reasons for studying Japanese, except for a slight difference in order, were identical with those of the main body of students: interest in Japan moved down to third place, with the desire to speak Japanese and understand spoken Japanese moving to the top, and an interest in job/career opportunities and a desire to be able to use job-related Japanese following. (See Table 5.7.)

Table 5.7: Reasons Given by NASILP Students for Studying Japanese (N=45)

	Not a Factor		Minor Factor		Major Factor		Most Important	
Reason	**No.[1]**	**%**	**No.[1]**	**%**	**No.[1]**	**%**	**No.[1]**	**%**
Interest in Japan	2	4.4	8	17.8	32	71.1	3	6.7
To Do Something Different	21	46.7	11	24.4	7	15.6	1	2.2
To Speak Japanese	0	0.0	3	6.7	38	84.4	7	15.6
To Understand Spoken Japanese	1	2.2	1	2.2	37	82.2	6	13.3
Required by Field of Specialization	26	57.8	8	17.8	3	6.7	0	0.0
To Be Able to Live in Japan	15	33.3	17	37.8	8	17.8	2	4.4
To Be Able to Use Job-Related Japanese	4	8.9	15	33.3	21	46.7	3	6.7
To Improve Job/Career Opportunities	2	4.4	14	31.1	23	51.1	2	4.4
To Speak to Japanese Friends	18	40.0	14	31.1	12	26.7	0	0.0
To Speak to Japanese Relatives	32	71.1	1	2.2	4	8.9	3	6.7
Family Is of Japanese Heritage	32	71.1	1	2.2	6	13.3	1	2.2
General Intellectual Curiosity	6	13.3	19	42.2	13	28.9	0	0.0
Interest in Language/Linguistics	9	20.0	17	37.8	15	33.3	2	4.4
Other	0	0.0	2	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

A NASILP program is often regarded, for the most part, as a practical way to introduce a language to a campus at which the institution is not ready to undertake a more expensive, more professional, and more permanent commitment to that language. Accordingly, it is valuable to understand the way this type of program compares with regular language programs, as well as its general strengths and weaknesses in the eyes of its students. It is clear that many students would prefer a regular class environment if it were available. However, surprisingly, a preference for study in a regular class won by only one vote, and in comparing their NASILP Japanese with other language courses they had taken, the vote was more supportive of NASILP: 25 percent found NASILP less effective, 41 percent more effective, and 27 percent equally effective. (See Table 5.8.) In answer to the question whether they considered NASILP a viable alternative when a formal Japanese program is not a possibility, 91 percent of the respondents answered in the affirmative.

Table 5.8: Comparison by Students of NASILP vs. Regular Programs

Comparison	Number	Percent
Never Studied a Foreign Language Before	3	6.8
Less Effective than Regular Courses	11	25.0
Equally Effective	12	27.3
More Effective than Regular Courses	18	40.9
Total	44	100.0

No Response = 1

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

There was strong agreement on the principal strength and weakness of a NASILP program. Its emphasis on oral skills was overwhelmingly considered a strength by the respondents. The program's greatest weakness, according to its students, was the fact that there was only one evaluation of students per semester, with excessive emphasis placed on the final exam. (See Tables 5.9 and 5.10.)

Table 5.9: NASILP Students' View of Japanese Self-Instructional Programs' Strengths (N=45)

Program Strengths	Checked[1]		Most Important	
	Number[2]	Percent	Number	Percent
Emphasis on Oral Skills	43	95.6	26	57.8
Use of Audiotapes	24	53.3	2	4.4
Use of Videotapes	19	42.2	0	0.0
Opportunity to Meet with a Native Speaker	38	84.4	12	26.7
Less Scheduled Class Time	8	17.8	0	0.0
Other	7	15.6	0	0.0

[1] Multiple answers possible
[2] Total number selected, including as most important

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Table 5.10: NASILP Students' View of Japanese Self-Instruction Programs' Weaknesses (N=45)

Program Weaknesses	Checked[1]		Most Important	
	Number[2]	Percent	Number	Percent
Limited Opportunities to Ask Questions	12	26.7	2	4.4
Limited Feedback During Semester	18	40.0	4	8.9
No Regular Instructional Classes	21	46.7	6	13.3
Only 1 Formal Evaluation per Semester	30	66.7	9	20.0
Excessive Emphasis on the Final Exam	26	57.8	8	17.8
Limited or No Feedback Following Exam	12	26.7	2	4.4
Other	11	24.4	2	4.4

[1] Multiple answers possible
[2] Total number selected, including as most important

Source: NASILP Students' Survey

Although this sample of NASILP students was admittedly small, the extent to which the general composition of the student body and their reasons for studying Japanese coincided with those of the general student sample was quite remarkable. Given the program's emphasis on oral skills, the constantly reiterated goal of so many Japanese students, overall student satisfaction among this NASILP group was the result. In spite of a curriculum format that precludes the depth that is possible in a regular formal program staffed by full-time professional teachers, these students were supportive of their training.

JAPANESE LANGUAGE TRAINING AND USE

SIX

U.S. Companies Doing Business with Japan

Among students in every category of Japanese language study in the United States, there has been a strong indication of instrumental motivation for studying the language. There is recurring mention of interest in developing job-related competence, and the job areas emphasized are those relating to business. There is value, then, in looking at the American business scene and examining its interest in Japanese language competence among its employees.

In a recent article on this subject, Bernice Cramer paints a rather gloomy picture.[1] She describes an apathetic attitude toward business expansion in Japan on the part of American companies, as well as their generally ethnocentric prejudices. As a result, Americans with Japanese competence find their best prospects with Japanese companies or possibly with American companies in Japan, but rarely with American companies at home. Nevertheless, Cramer finds that Japanese competence and knowledge of the acquired culture of Japan have a direct relation to success in the Japanese business world. This presumes, of course, knowledge of business as well, usually learned after the language. The number of Americans who have this language and business knowledge is small, but one thing is clear: It does not include businesspeople who tried to learn the language after arriving in Japan or through brief crash courses taken before leaving the United States.

Although the focus here was on U.S. companies that are now doing business with Japan, it was surprisingly difficult to find the kind of figures needed. Available data were not easily located. Frequently, it was a matter of being referred from one agency to another, only to end up at the beginning, with no useful information. Even more elusive was information on an organization's interest in Japanese language competence. This does not appear to be a matter of concern that is recognized, or even identifiable, in the various divisions of most large corporations. In one case, the startling explanation that "At *this* company, we don't interfere in the private lives of our employees" was given.

The study that follows is based on a special business-related survey instrument submitted by 17 corporations. Sixteen U.S.-based corporations submitted questionnaires, 13 of these from U.S. offices and 3 from corporate offices in Japan. It should be noted that all of the U.S.-based corporations surveyed have offices in Japan. Completing the sample was one Japan-based corporation with an office in the United States. This group represents a cross-section of companies doing business in Japan, with industries ranging from transportation to chemicals. (See Table 6.1.)

Table 6.1: Business Respondents to Survey by Industry (N=17)

Industry	Location	Headquarters
Packaging	U.S.	U.S.
Translation	U.S.	U.S.
Distribution	U.S.	U.S.
Chemicals	Japan	U.S.
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	U.S.	U.S.
Transportation	U.S.	U.S.
Computers	U.S.	U.S.
Aerospace	U.S.	U.S.
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	U.S.	U.S.
Finance	U.S.	Japan
Paper Products	U.S.	U.S.
Electronics/Distribution	U.S.	U.S.
Transportation	Japan	U.S.
Food	U.S.	U.S.
Communications	Japan	U.S.
Information Services	U.S.	U.S.
Electronics	U.S.	U.S.

Source: Japanese Business Survey

The primary interest was to discover the extent to which Americans with Japanese competence do, in fact, handle business activities at these companies using Japanese. A direct question to this effect painted a picture discouraging for those language students planning a business career. Frequently, it was not all, most, or some of such activities that were turned over to Americans with Japanese competence. Indeed, the greatest number indicated that little or none of this work was handled by them. Instead, this kind of work usually goes to Japanese native speakers, both permanent employees and temporary employees/consultants. (See Table 6.2.)

Table 6.2: Share of Business Activities Requiring Japanese in Japan and in the United States by Employee Type (N=17)

Employee Type/Native Language	In Japan					In the United States				
	None	Little	Some	Most	All	None	Little	Some	Most	All
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Permanent Employees										
Japanese Citizens	1	0	3	9	3	5	3	4	2	1
Japanese-Americans	6	4	3	0	1	8	3	3	0	0
Americans Who Learned Japanese as a Foreign Language	2	7	4	2	0	6	6	1	1	1
Temporary Employees/ Consultants										
Japanese Citizens	5	2	2	4	3	9	2	1	2	0
Japanese-Americans	10	3	0	0	1	7	6	0	0	0
Americans Who Learned Japanese as a Foreign Language	10	1	2	0	1	10	2	0	1	0

Source: Japanese Business Survey

An examination of these companies' permanent employees—working both in the United States and outside the United States (including Japan)—shows that very few Americans who learned Japanese as a foreign language are employed by these companies. Most disheartening to current students are the hiring predictions for the next three years: There seems to be little interest in increasing the number of Japanese speakers who are Americans. (See Tables 6.3 and 6.4.)

Table 6.3: Permanent Employees Working Outside the United States (Including Japan) by Industry

Industry	Total Current Permanent Employees			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	0	1	0	15
Translation	0	0	0	0
Distribution	8	0	1	2
Chemicals	1,500	2	10	10
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	1,500	1	3	2
Transportation	314	10	5	2,700
Computers	30	2	2	7
Aerospace	2	-	1	1
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	120	1	3	55
Finance	0	0	0	0
Paper Products	32	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	18,000	500	25	1,000
Transportation	975	1	1	2
Food	-	-	-	-
Communications	100	-	1	2
Information Services	750	10	5	8
Electronics	checked	checked	-	-

Industry	Permanent Employees Hired in the Last 3 Years			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	0	0	0	0
Translation	1	0	0	0
Distribution	2	0	1	0
Chemicals	200	1	-	-
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	50	1	1	1
Transportation	5	3	5	500
Computers	10	-	-	-
Aerospace	1	-	1	1
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	20	-	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	12	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	2,500	-	10	100
Transportation	500	1	1	0
Food	-	-	-	-
Communications	-	-	1	-
Information Services	75	0	5	-
Electronics	-	-	-	-

Table 6.3: Permanent Employees Working Outside the United States (Including Japan) by Industry (continued)

Industry	Permanent Employees Expected to be Hired in the Next 3 Years			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	2	0	0	0
Translation	1	0	1	0
Distribution	-	-	-	0
Chemicals	200	2	5	-
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	50	-	2	1
Transportation	10	5	2	500
Computers	-	-	2	-
Aerospace	-	-	-	-
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	36	2	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	15	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	1,500	50	-	25
Transportation	200	5	0	0
Food	-	-	-	-
Communications	-	-	-	-
Information Services	100	0	10	-
Electronics	-	-	checked	checked

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Table 6.4: Permanent Employees Working in the United States by Industry

Industry	Total Current Permanent Employees			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	0	0	1	0
Translation	5	5	4	0
Distribution	0	0	0	4,000
Chemicals	10	10	2	15,000
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	-	-	6	30,000
Transportation	10	10	2	2,700
Computers	1	1	1	15
Aerospace	0	0	0	0
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	1	1	-	25,000
Finance	200	200	10	3,300
Paper Products	1	1	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	150	150	20	50,000
Transportation	2	2	-	71,000
Food	0	0	1	-
Communications	-	-	-	-
Information Services	5	5	10	38,000
Electronics	-	-	-	checked

Table 6.4: Permanent Employees Working in the United States by Industry (continued)

Industry	Permanent Employees Hired in the Last 3 Years			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	0	0	0	0
Translation	6	1	7	1
Distribution	8	0	0	-
Chemicals	-	-	-	500
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	-	-	-	-
Transportation	5	3	0	500
Computers	-	-	-	5
Aerospace	-	-	-	-
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	-	-	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	1	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	20	-	3	2,000
Transportation	2	0	-	-
Food	0	0	1	-
Communications	-	-	-	-
Information Services	5	-	10	-
Electronics	checked	-	-	-

Industry	Permanent Employees Expected to be Hired in the Next 3 Years			
	Japanese Citizen Native Speakers	Japanese-American Native Speakers	U.S. Citizens with Japanese	U.S. Citizens without Japanese
Packaging	2	0	0	0
Translation	10	1	5	0
Distribution	0	0	0	-
Chemicals	5	2	-	500
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	-	-	-	-
Transportation	5	3	0	500
Computers	-	-	-	-
Aerospace	-	-	-	-
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	1	2	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	-	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	10	-	-	1,500
Transportation	2	0	-	-
Food	0	0	0	-
Communications	-	-	-	-
Information Services	20	-	10	-
Electronics	checked	checked	checked	-

Source: Japanese Business Survey

In the Japanese branches of these companies, native Japanese hold positions at all levels except upper-level management. What is not clear is whether Japanese language-related activities are handled by them because they are holding these positions or whether they are hired for these positions because they can also handle such activities. (See Table 6.5.)

Table 6.5: Positions Held by Native Speakers of Japanese Employed by U.S. Companies in Japan (N=17)

Position	None	A Few	Some	Most	All
	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]
Upper-Level Management	6	1	2	5	2
Mid- and Low-Level Management	3	1	3	2	7
Research Personnel	6	0	2	3	5
Technical/Design Personnel	6	1	0	2	5
Sales/Marketing Personnel	4	2	0	1	9
Secretarial/Support Staff	3	1	2	2	8
Manufacturing Personnel	7	0	1	2	6
Translators/Interpreters	9	1	0	1	4
Other	4	0	1	0	12

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Surprisingly, only three respondents felt that social interaction in Japanese was very important for Americans in Japan, although six respondents indicated that external spoken communication and external meetings and negotiations were of high priority. These latter functions, of course, require a high level of proficiency, one that would be far beyond the capability of the average American employee, were he or she not a Japanese language specialist. (See Table 6.6.)

Table 6.6: Importance Placed on Use of Japanese among Permanent Nonnative Speakers (N=17)

	Irrelevant	Slightly Helpful	Helpful	Important	Very Important
Activity	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]
Shopping, Travel, etc.	3	2	3	2	3
Social Interaction	0	2	6	2	3
General Reading	3	4	5	0	1
Technical or Specialized Reading	6	1	4	1	1
Internal Written Communication	3	5	2	2	1
Internal Spoken Communication	0	1	8	2	2
Internal Meetings and Negotiations	0	2	5	4	2
External Written Communication	4	3	4	1	1
External Spoken Communication	1	0	5	1	6
External Meetings and Negotiations	1	1	4	1	6
Other	1	0	0	0	0

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Throughout the survey, there is indication of a very poor understanding of the field of foreign language study and foreign language competence among the business community. The employee who claims some level of competence is rarely tested by any meaningful measure: The largest group (eight) of respondents indicated that no evaluation was conducted, and five companies use an informal interview or observation. Presumably, the latter procedures are not carried out by a person with the knowledge of how to test. (See Table 6.7.)

Table 6.7: Japanese Language Testing of Employees (N=17)

	Career Stage		
Test(s)	When Hired[1]	Following Training[1]	Performance Review or Promotion[1]
No Evaluation Is Conducted	8	8	9
Informal Interview/Observation	5	1	0
ILR Proficiency Test	0	0	0
ACTFL Proficiency Test	1	0	0
Company Test	0	0	0
Other Test Developed Outside Company	1	0	0

[1]Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Very few of the respondents indicated that their companies provide language training for their employees. (See Tables 6.8 and 6.9.) One company offers a course that teaches "260 words" and another, a 300-hour course that claims to produce a level 3 in speaking and listening and a level 1 in reading and writing. Here again, one encounters a total misunderstanding of the meaning of the levels, in spite of the careful description that is provided.

Table 6.8: Japanese Language Training Provided in Japan by Industry

Industry	Companies Own Training	Private Tutoring	Commercial Language School	College
Packaging	-	-	-	-
Translation	0	0	0	0
Distribution	0	0	0	0
Chemicals	-	-	25	-
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	-	3	1	-
Transportation	0	1	-	-
Computers	-	2	-	-
Aerospace	0	0	0	0
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	-	-	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	-	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	0	4	5	0
Transportation	0	9	0	0
Food	0	0	0	0
Communications	-	1	-	-
Information Services	0	0	0	0
Electronics	8	5	-	-

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Table 6.9: Japanese Language Training Provided in the United States by Industry

Industry	Companies Own Training	Private Tutoring	Commercial Language School	College
Packaging	-	-	-	-
Translation	2	1	0	1
Distribution	0	0	0	0
Chemicals	-	-	-	-
Medicine/Pharmaceutical	-	-	1	-
Transportation	0	0	-	-
Computers	-	-	-	-
Aerospace	0	0	0	0
Chemicals/Textiles/Medicine	-	-	-	-
Finance	-	-	-	-
Paper Products	-	-	-	-
Electronics/Distribution	0	0	0	0
Transportation	-	-	-	-
Food	0	0	0	0
Communications	-	-	-	-
Information Services	0	0	0	0
Electronics	75	25	-	-

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Three respondents who answered a query regarding their companies' expenditure for language training indicted that 1 percent or less of the budget was allocated for this purpose. The failure of others to respond suggests that this item is not a major expense in any of the other budgets. Other questions regarding training programs had so few responses as to make any conclusions meaningless. The implication is that there is little concern for language training among the companies interviewed.

Of the respondents, five suggested that Japanese language competence was a very important asset for an applicant (see Table 6.10), and nine indicated that such competence is recorded in an employee's personnel file. At three of the companies, non-Japanese employees are said to receive extra pay for having some level of Japanese language competence. However, when it comes to use of such skills, at only three of the companies, is it always guaranteed and, at five, sometimes. (See Table 6.11.)

Table 6.10: Importance of Japanese Language Competence among Non-Japanese Employees (N=17)

Career Decisions	In Japan					In the United States				
	Handicap	Irrelevant	Somewhat Helpful	Important	Very Important	Handicap	Irrelevant	Somewhat Helpful	Important	Very Important
	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]
Hiring	0	2	2	2	5	0	8	3	0	1
New Assignments	0	4	5	0	2	0	7	2	1	1
Promotion	0	7	2	0	2	0	10	1	1	0
Salary Increases	0	9	0	0	2	0	11	0	1	0

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Table 6.11: Career Track Placement of Nonnative Employees with Japanese Language Competence (N=17)

Career Track	Never	Rarely[1]	Sometimes[1]	Often[1]	All the Time[1]
	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]
One that Guarantees Use of Japanese Language Skills	2	2	5	1	3
One with Limited Prospects for Career Advancement	5	5	3	0	0
One that Limits Employees in the Future to Japan-Related Assignments	3	4	2	2	2

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Even familiarity with various aspects of Japanese culture is considered important to successfully conduct business by comparatively few companies. Extensive knowledge of social conventions and business culture is considered very important by only three respondents, and of personal behavior and values, only two. (See Table 6.12.) Such ethnocentric attitudes at this time can only be considered shocking.

Table 6.12: Nonnative Employees Needing Extensive Knowledge of Japanese Culture (N=17)

Cultural Aspects	None	A Few	Some	Most	All
	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]	Number[1]
Politics	5	3	0	0	1
Economics	3	5	1	0	1
Business Culture	0	7	1	0	3
History	6	1	1	1	0
Literature and Art	4	2	1	0	0
Religion/Philosophy	6	1	1	0	0
Social Conventions	2	0	0	0	3
Personal Behavior and Values	1	0	1	0	2

[1] Multiple answers possible

Source: Japanese Business Survey

Obviously, there are other companies whose approach to language and culture is very different from that of the companies of this survey, but there are undoubtedly many others that fit this mold. Thus, there exists a paradox: A nation of students enthusiastically pursuing Japanese language study for entrance into a business world that basically seems not to acknowledge their worth.

When one examines the FALCON graduates' current employment patterns, there is confirmation of what has just been described: Very few are working for American companies in Japan. (See Table 4.5.) Many are continuing Japan-related work, but it is in other categories. A considerable number have been able to establish their own businesses, some of which are in Japan, but the obvious type of employer is actually the least common.

There is, however, another side to this problem that cannot be ignored. If the competence of American employees with a Category 4 language is at a level that enables them only to make simple telephone calls and not fully allow them to follow and participate in business negotiations or follow a business-related discussion on television, of course the American employer will prefer a native Japanese employee, when language competence is at issue.

Americans with Japanese language competence are also constantly being reminded that they will never be hired for that alone. No matter how strong their language skills, they will never be as proficient as a native speaker. However, if they *also* have the appropriate training and experience in business and, what is more, are native speakers of English, they should be extremely appealing as an employee of the American company in Japan.

American students who think that a year or two of Japanese in high school or college will result in countless job offers from American firms in Japan or the United States have been wrongly informed. First, these students must worry about business qualifications and, second, they must be sure their Japanese competence is at an extremely high level. At that point, if it is the American firm in Japan or the United States that appeals to them, they should be very strong job applicants. Yet, even given such qualifications, they cannot be sure that their hard-earned competence will always be used to its fullest advantage.

Endnotes

1. Bernice A. Cramer, "Developing Competitive Skill: How American Businesspeople Learn Japanese," *Foreign Language and the Workplace*, Richard D. Lambert and Sarah Jane Moore, eds., *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 511 (September 1990): 85-96.

SEVEN

U.S. Government

To determine the extent to which personnel with Japanese competence are required within the government, a specially designed survey instrument was distributed to a number of government agencies. Here, five returned questionnaires will be examined. They represent a cross-section of the existing situations. Detailed information from the language schools—the Defense Language Schools, the National Cryptologic School of the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency—serving the intelligence community was not available. These schools have very substantial language teaching capacity, much of it of the fully intensive format, however, like much of the rest of the federal government agencies, the teaching of Japanese is probably a surprisingly small part of their activities. Accordingly, the data presented below relate only to the agencies outside the intelligence communities that provide language training for their employees.

The Treasury Department is representative of the agencies that have virtually no interest in Japanese language competence. It has no language-designated positions that require Japanese, and its hiring, promotion, and salary increase policies do not involve Japanese. However, Japanese competence is recorded in employees' files, and the agency makes available beginning Japanese language instruction for interested personnel, at the agency's expense.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Library is another agency with no language-designated positions in Japanese, although there is mention of the need for a translator, for which, unfortunately, a slot has not been established. At the present time, outside consultants with the necessary language skills are hired as the need arises. Employees of the library receive no salary increases for Japanese competence, nor is there any indication that such competence is recorded in their files. However, like the Treasury Department, the library provides the opportunity for studying Japanese. In this case, courses described as beginning, intermediate, and advanced, are offered, for which the library covers all costs.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) shows slightly greater interest in Japanese language ability. Using a scale of 0 to 5, with each level carefully defined in the questionnaire according to the regular Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) / American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) scale, all of the agency respondents were asked to indicate the number of language-designated positions in their agencies and general proficiency level in speaking, listening, reading, and writing that was required of employees assigned to those positions. (See Table 7.1.) Although, the FBI has just one language-designated position, at level 4+ in speaking and level 5 in listening, apparently there is concern for Japanese competence beyond that indicated by this number. There is mention of the agency's need for translators and special agents at level 3 in speaking and listening. As at the NIH Library, special consultants are hired with the necessary language skills when the need arises. Japanese competence, measured by the ILR/ACTFL test and a specially prepared FBI examination, is considered very important in hiring, promotion, and in granting salary increases. It is made a matter of record on an employee's file. The agency provides the opportunity for its personnel to study Japanese at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels and also for specialized language skills, both in the United States and abroad, and assumes responsibility for all costs. For training, the FBI uses the Defense Language Institute (DLI), Foreign Service Institute, and proprietary schools.

Table 7.1: Scale Used for Rating the Typical Level of Proficiency of Students

Levels	**Tasks Possible at Each Level**
0 = Little or No Communicative Competence	A small number of high-frequency words and phrases
1 = Survival Competence	Personal and every day topics, complete sentences, questions and answers
2 = Limited Professional and Social Competence	General topics, current events, connected sentences, basic narration and description
3 = Full Professional and Social Competence	Abstract and technical topics, detailed narration and description, defending opinions
4 = Near-Native Competence	Highly abstract, specialized and technical topics, oral interpretation, persuasion, negotiation
5 = Competence Equivalent to an Educated Native Speaker	

Source: ILR/ACTFL

The National Science Foundation is an agency that has some limited concern for Japanese language competence among its employees, but very serious concern for competence among its constituents. Within the agency, there are eight language-designated positions, four at level 5 in all skills, and four at level 2 in all skills except writing (for which there is no requirement). Most of the time, this agency, too, hires outside consultants with the necessary skills as the need arises. There is indication of increased need in the future for Japanese-competent translators, program administrators, science officers, and support staff. Japanese ability, determined by an informal interview, is helpful, but not important for being hired, promoted, or given salary increases. However, there is no regular system for receiving salary raises on the basis of competence, although skill in Japanese is recorded in an employee's file. The foundation provides its employees with full or partial support to study beginning level Japanese and specialized language skills in the United States and intermediate language and specialized skills abroad. Training is provided by proprietary schools.

If one considers the constituents of the NSF, however, there is an urgent need for Japanese language competence. The survey questionnaire points out the serious shortage of research scientists and engineers with Japanese proficiency and the failure of the scientific community to recognize this.

Turning to the Department of State, one finds an example of a government agency that recognizes, in its Foreign Service section, a serious requirement for Japanese language competence. The Department of State questionnaire lists 38 language-designated positions at level 3 in all skill areas. In addition, there is mention of the need for civil service translators and interpreters at level 5 in all skills, and consular and administrative personnel needed at level 2 in all skills except writing. For the latter, there is said to be a serious shortage because few applicants have had the training necessary to provide them with the necessary proficiency, and the department itself does not allocate sufficient training time. Language competence is a very important factor in promotion in the Foreign Service, and salary raises automatically accrue when an employee already has, or acquires, a level 2 proficiency or higher, as determined by an official FSI examination. Those who enter the Foreign Service, already having gained Japanese competence, usually learned the language in the country in which it is spoken according to the questionnaire—45 percent in college programs and 20 percent through private tutoring. Only 5 percent are said to have learned the language in American colleges. When the Foreign Service is lacking in a sufficient number of individuals with the required competence for a senior position, the responsibilities of the vacant position are usually assigned to agency personnel who have the required language skills. For less senior positions, occasionally, the position is left vacant until an employee with the required skill can be trained, but attempts are made to train employees in advance to enable them to move into positions as soon as they become vacant.

All training and testing for the Foreign Service is done by the State Department's own Foreign Service Institute, which provides language training for many of the other government agencies in Washington. The oral interview language exam, on which the ILR/ACTFL test is based, was originally developed at FSI, where full-time intensive language courses have also been offered since its establishment.

Like the Foreign Service, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the intelligence agencies, and, of course, the military have serious concern for foreign language competence among their personnel. FSI provides much of the training for USIA and has handled some programs for the military, but, for the most part, language training for the intelligence agencies and the military are provided within their own language schools. The Defense Language Institute is a major facility, offering language instruction in a number of languages, including Japanese. Like FSI, DLI provides full-time intensive courses of approximately the same duration (i.e., 47 weeks), at the end of which a special DLI proficiency test is administered to all participants.

It is encouraging to note that even those government agencies that do not see themselves as requiring personnel with Japanese language competence are making language study available to their personnel. It is less encouraging to note that agencies with considerable numbers of employees serving abroad (as, for example, are the Treasury Department and the FBI) continue to have so few positions that are judged to require Japanese language competence.

The FSI Intensive Japanese Program

At FSI, specially selected personnel are assigned to full-time training for an extended period of time (usually 44 weeks), for the purpose of preparing for the language-designated positions described above. At the present time, the only comparable training in the university setting is FALCON.

A visit to FSI found a Japanese class with an enrollment of 14 students, being taught by five different instructors. The staff was made up entirely of native speakers, all of whom were women and several of whom were wives of Foreign Service officers. Administrative matters pertaining to the program were being handled by a half-time administrator, a retired Foreign Service officer with advanced proficiency in Japanese, who had no connection with the course curriculum or any language-related problems the students might encounter. The teachers' expertise was equated principally with their experience, rather than professional academic training, and the range was tremendous: The most senior instructor had been teaching Japanese at FSI for more than 30 years and had worked with a number of supervisory linguists during periods when FSI employed personnel in that category. On-the-job training is necessarily limited at the present time because of the full-time teachers' heavy teaching schedule (about five hours per day).

Probably stemming from the fact that the students were being given few exams and no grades, the general atmosphere seemed very relaxed, with no sense of pressure, compared with university courses in general, including FALCON. At an arbitrary point agreed upon by the instructors, all pronunciation correction had been terminated on the grounds that no improvement could be effected. This decision had no relation to the quality of the students' pronunciation at that time, nor the serious nature of some errors.

At the end of the 44-week course, the students were to be rated on the basis of an FSI Oral Interview Proficiency Test, administered by instructors who had been their teachers during their intensive training. Satisfactory achievement would be level 2 in speaking and level 2 in reading on the FSI scale. According to the students, they are so well known to the teachers that the ratings can, of course, be predicted even before the test is administered.

Except for two officers' wives who had been permitted to join the course, the students at FSI were experienced Foreign Service officers, college graduates (some with graduate degrees), and male. These students were considerably older than most college (including FALCON) students, ranging in age from early thirties to mid-forties. The difficulties regularly encountered by older students trying to learn this Category 4 language were found to apply here as well. The question would undoubtedly arise as to whether the 2/2 rating could be achieved by everyone. However, with 5 hours per day of class over a period of 44 weeks, younger students with better than average aptitude could be expected to reach their goal.

More advanced Japanese language training, which follows the FSI-Washington course, is offered at the FSI field school in Yokohama. There, the continuation of intensive training aims to bring students to level 3, the competence mentioned in the questionnaire as that of the designated positions.

For determining the salient features that have a direct influence on foreign language learning, an in-depth study of the FSI, DLI, and FALCON programs could yield interesting and important results.

EIGHT

Proprietary Foreign Language Schools

The Japanese instruction described within this report has either been part of the organized educational system or special purpose instruction aimed at particular occupational use. There is a substantial additional set of language schools, the commercial language schools, that provide both specific training for workplace needs and foreign language training for individual adults who want or need language skills for their own purposes. This unorganized sector of the national foreign language system requires a detailed analysis. In the time available, only very general information was gathered on Japanese instruction in a number of such schools. These schools were not examined in any detail, and Japanese language teaching strategies in such schools were not evaluated. A serious barrier to such examinations is that many of their techniques are privately developed and owned and not open to external inspection. However, some general information was collected by questionnaire from 24 schools scattered throughout the country, and another 12 provided background information via telephone interview.

Like Japanese enrollments in academic institutions, the enrollments in Japanese at the proprietary schools surveyed have been generally increasing during the past 10 years. Only two of the respondents noted a decrease, and as many as five reported that enrollments had stayed the same in some categories of students. The remainder all showed an increase, ranging from 10 percent to 377 percent. Projections for the next three years continue to be optimistic: Only one school expects to lose enrollment in general in Japanese, five expect enrollment to stay the same, and the remaining respondents believe enrollment at their schools will continue to increase, from 10 percent to 200 percent. The predictions for business clients in particular are similar, except that only two schools expect to stay the same. For students representing the federal government/military, only 13 schools made predictions: Five expect to remain the same, and the remaining eight expect to increase, from 10 percent to 100 percent. Only nine responses were submitted that relate to academic clients: Two expect to stay the same, and the remainder to increase, from 25 percent to 100 percent.

The pedagogical picture that emerges at these proprietary schools is, once again, one of unbounded variation. With no standardized measurement procedures in use in most of these schools, their curricula and methodology show no agreement. A considerable amount of the teaching at proprietary schools is in the form of private tutoring. It is the ability to begin and terminate enrollment according to individual needs that makes the proprietary schools appealing to many people. The business executive just informed that she or he will be going to Tokyo in six weeks is able to enroll immediately for a few weeks of Japanese instruction before his or her departure.

At the other end of the scale are programs that cater to a resident group of people interested in Japan. The courses offered by branches of the Japan Society throughout the United States are an example of such programs. These classes have enrollments ranging from small to very large, and teachers have varied backgrounds, experience, and pedagogical leanings.

Some of the proprietary schools, however, train government personnel on a full-time intensive basis, aiming at specific well-defined levels of proficiency required by the agency to which the students belong. In such cases, standardized government tests, administered to the students upon their return to work, serve as guides to curriculum and establish standards for their language study at a proprietary school.

The Japanese programs at the respondent schools range in age from 6 months to 112 years (the latter figure submitted by the Berlitz School). Of the 24 programs surveyed, 7 are 5 years old or less, and 16 are 10 years old or less. The 1989 enrollments range from 2 to 1,500 students, with 25 or fewer at 14 of the schools. All of the Japanese programs offer elementary- and intermediate-level courses, but for more advanced and specialized courses, the number decreases. For example, only 10 schools offer business- and law-related courses, and there are only 7 courses in journalism.

In identifying their 1989 students, 19 of the 24 respondents checked business clients (with an average number of students between 11 and 50), and 16 identified private individuals (with a similar average). The business personnel at 12 schools were identified as largely senior-level managers (41 to 60 percent), and by 9 schools as middle- and low-level managers (averaging the same percentage). Only eight schools had federal government and military personnel (with an average of less than 10 students), and even fewer programs had students from academia, including all levels from elementary school to graduate school (again averaging as many as 10 students each).

Of the business students, 81 to 100 percent were identified as learning to speak Japanese as an objective of their study at 19 schools and listening at 17 schools. At 16 schools, reading was an objective of 41 to 60 percent of the enrollees, with the same percentage at 14 schools interested in writing. There was interest in cultural awareness and job specific skills and vocabulary among 61 to 80 percent at 14 schools. Once again, proficiency in oral skills proves to be the major objective of American students.

These respondent schools are staffed almost entirely by native speakers of Japanese; among all the staffs, only three part-time nonnative instructors were noted. Insofar as there are any requirements for employment, the emphasis seems to be on experience. The assumption is that experience, even without training, will produce a skilled teacher. In a few of the schools, some training is provided on-site after hiring, but such cases seem to be in the minority.

Of the respondents, 16 use unpublished elementary materials prepared on-site, 15 schools use published materials; at the intermediate level, 14 schools use their own unpublished materials, while published materials are used at 18 schools. At the advanced level, 12 schools prepare their own materials, and 15 schools use published materials. Thus, one is reminded again of the cottage industry in materials preparation that flourishes at all levels of Japanese language instruction. Insofar as published materials are used in the proprietary schools, they tend to include a wide range of titles, with

Japanese for Busy People, a text less commonly used in academic circles, emerging as the one that is most frequently mentioned.

Along with programs that use more traditional approaches are those that guarantee remarkable degrees of fluency in a short period through the use of special methodologies. In one of the schools contacted, students are taught "the 1,000 most common words and the 450 most common phrases." Pronunciation at this school is taught via English terms; thus, *oyasumi* becomes "oh yeah sue me"! Because evaluation—if it occurs at all—is made within the school, there is no way to check on students' terminal proficiency.

Even a cursory examination of the range of instructional strategies and staffing patterns of the commercial language school highlights a major problem of quality control, particularly at the margin. Along with conservative achievable goals established at some schools are the extravagant claims made by others, which continue without being challenged: Requirements for truth in advertising do not extend to language teaching.

Newspaper articles are sometimes seen these days, showing an American studying Japanese in his office with an instructor from a local proprietary school. In one recent article, the American was said to be repeating, after the instructor, Japanese sentences he will undoubtedly never have any occasion to use. He explains in the article that he wants to help destroy the image of the American who cannot speak any foreign languages, but, unfortunately, the effort required to learn a meaningful amount of Japanese is more than he is willing to devote to the task. And, it is unlikely that his instructor has received the training required to help him make even a meaningful start.

Some of the more established schools, in part at the persuasion of their largest clients in the federal government and in business, are trying to achieve standards to ferret out some of the more flagrant examples of misrepresentation. A group has been working with the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM), a national standard-setting organization, to develop such standards, and a professional organization of proprietary language schools—the Association of Proprietary and Public Language Schools (APPLS)—has been formed to implement those standards within the community. It is clear from this survey, and from the deliberations of these standard-setting groups, that one overwhelming need is to develop a metric for measuring the degree of competence that students attain.

In the evaluation of students, approximately one-half of the schools that were surveyed use their own tests, and about 15 percent do no testing at all. Two schools use tests provided by the students' parent organization. Several schools claim to use federal ILR/ACTFL proficiency tests and others make reference to FSI, DLI, and Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT), particularly for the testing of government employees. It becomes clear in the assessment of course results that only a few respondents, who deal closely with government agencies, understand what an official test in these categories involves.

The total lack of agreement among the proprietary schools as to the rating of students is evident when one examines the scores they assign to their students. Using a scale of 0 to 5, with each level carefully defined in the questionnaires according to the regular ILR/ACTFL scale, respondents were asked to indicate the typical results of training in short, medium-length, and long courses at their schools. (See Table 7.1.) The surprising range of replies indicates a widespread misunderstanding of what these levels imply in terms of actual language competence. It is useful to be aware of the tendency to overestimate levels of ability in the earlier portions of this survey, but it is not as serious as that indicated by the proprietary schools. For example, a 15-hour short course at one school regularly results in competence at the "1" level (survival competence), and a 188-hour program at another, a "2" (limited professional and social competence), but 120 hours at another, a "0+." The discrepancies continue in the medium length programs: A "2" may be the typical result of courses of 18 to 150 hours, but a 600-hour course brings students typically to a "1+" at another school. Long courses, ranging from 36 hours to 1,200 hours, depending on the school, result in usual ratings of "1", "2", "3" (full professional and social competence), or "4" (near native competence), with absolutely no correlation between the number of hours of instruction and the rating. The most significant figure in all this confusion is the only one identified as an *official* ILR rating: It accompanies a "2" rating given typically for students completing a course of 1,100 hours. It would appear that at almost 90 percent of the proprietary schools that were surveyed, there is misunderstanding of foreign language ratings as recognized by the professional language testing organizations in the United States and a seriously inflated assessment of students' competence upon completion of their courses.

The effort made by those in the proprietary schools to learn Japanese should certainly not be discouraged; on the other hand, the results of their training programs should not be exaggerated. No one can expect to be able to discuss current events or narrate a story after 18 hours of Japanese instruction, and claims to that effect must be viewed with great suspicion. Use of recognized tests should not be limited to government employees and military personnel. Corporations that assign personnel for language training should be just as interested to learn what was actually accomplished. Those proprietary schools that train their students seriously and produce measurable results should welcome the growing number of effective measures of language competence, and they should endorse such instruments, using them as proof of their teaching success. When the results are less significant, they should also receive recognition, but for no more than what they actually are. In point of fact, the proprietary schools are almost the only place that adults in the United States not enrolled in an academic institution can turn to learn Japanese. As such, they deserve a great deal more attention.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NINE

Executive Summary

For the first time in history, a language unrelated to English, a "truly foreign language," has been mainstreamed in the American system of education. That language is, of course, Japanese. With little warning, educational institutions at every level have been called on to provide Japanese language courses where they had never been taught before. The challenge has been awesome, and it has been met with results that are impressive. When criticisms have been raised, they are often countered with the argument that the same problems still exist in the programs of the commonly taught languages. Yet many feel that the Japanese language field, in spite of its rapid growth, is still small enough for these problems to be eliminated. The hope is that it is not too late to "do things right this time!" It is in this context that the items below are drawn from the survey results for consideration. The conclusions and recommendations listed below attempt to look forward, toward a national agenda in Japanese studies. Although the data in the previous pages document the immense accomplishments that have been achieved, in this section the problems have been highlighted because it is to these that efforts to improve Japanese language instruction should be directed.

In the best of all foreign language study worlds, one can imagine a nationally accepted, carefully structured course of study for Japanese, extending from elementary instruction, introduced at any time starting with the optimal time within the K-12 period, to the most advanced training at the undergraduate and postgraduate university level. This best possible curriculum would have been developed by a committee of specialists, including practitioners from all levels of instruction, both native Japanese and American. Principles of foreign language learning that had been tested and proven to be valid for Japanese would have been carefully adhered to, and effective teaching materials—print, audio, video, and computerized—would have been developed, together with validated evaluation instruments for measuring both student progress and program quality. The actual teaching of these materials would, of course, differ, depending on the individual teacher, because teaching is an art, as well as a reflection of academically sound training. All parts of this comprehensive curriculum would be subject to revision and improvement as continuing research and added experience increased the general knowledge of language pedagogy specifically relevant to Japanese.

The introductory level of instruction would reflect equal concern for both the many short-term students of Japanese and those planning to continue. However, through a variety of specialized study materials, differing student goals would be recognized at the advanced levels, following coverage of the core language required of all learners of the language. This kind of unified curriculum would enable students transferring from one academic institution to another to continue their Japanese studies efficiently, with minimal loss of momentum.

The worst case scenario looks very different. It is not difficult to imagine Japanese language programs introduced randomly and independently in schools and colleges throughout the country as they join the "Japanese boom." The new programs are each turned over to a single instructor whose credentials for the task may be extremely weak—an American teacher already on the faculty with Japanese proficiency ranging from limited and seriously inaccurate to zero-level (this latter type of instructor is expected to enroll in a beginning course in the Japanese language) or a native speaker of Japanese, a specialist in anything from English literature to geology, who has never been trained to teach Japanese as a foreign language or an American specialist in Japanese studies—literature or theoretical linguistics, or religion, for example—again with no training in foreign language pedagogy. Added to these are the "quick-fixers," who promise fluency (undefined) in Japanese (or any other foreign language) in 200 hours. The goals of training; methodology; materials; use or nonuse of audio, video, and computers; pacing—everything is different, depending on the individual instructor's views. These stem not from any expertise in the subject, but rather from the personal beliefs, assumptions, myths, and prejudices in which a layman may be steeped. The objective measurement of student progress in the language is nonexistent, and the evaluation of a program as a whole is, at most, a survey having to do with whether or not the students had fun, rather than how much they actually learned. For the most part, the short-term learner studies only what amounts to the initial portion of an advanced curriculum, in spite of its many useless features as an independent course of study. And let the students who transfer from one institution to another beware: Far from being able to assume the advantages of articulation among programs, there is a distinct possibility they may encounter a new curriculum so different that the only way to participate requires starting again from its introductory level. Research on pedagogy is nonexistent, and there is little or no meaningful contact among programs.

Within this scenario, so-called "experts," with virtually no competence in the language whatsoever, are everywhere, taking to task the low standard of requirements that have been set for foreign language teaching. In spite of the unique demands of the field, relating to both skill transfer and cognitive learning, the geologist or engineer or specialist in literature—or even a person with no particular specialization—is allowed to function as a language teacher, although the highly trained PhD in pedagogical linguistics would never be judged competent to teach geology or engineering or literature. Totally ignored, in this worst-case scenario, are the very special demands required of a teacher of a Category 4, truly foreign language: The previous teaching of French is of only limited value.

Although the first scenario has not been realized in all its demanding features, there are, to be sure, superior Japanese programs in the United States—at least the equal of the best anywhere and worthy of imitation. However, in these findings, one also detects evidence that many of the programs clearly reflect features of the second scenario.

Unfortunately, at the present time, there is no professionally prepared, objective, validated testing instruments that measure the extent to which programs are producing meaningful results in terms of student competence. Where is the cut-off placed between good and inadequate programs, and how can the inadequate program be helped? To what extent are the results of pre-collegiate programs reflecting student goals?

All conclusions reached in this survey are based on detailed survey instruments, submitted by pre-collegiate and postsecondary principals/program administrators, teachers, and students of Japanese, augmented by data based on direct observation of Japanese language programs by a case study team. It is a study of these data that has revealed the points that follow, all of which call for careful thought and supportive, remedial action.

Principal Problems

1. In contrast with the college teachers of Japanese, most of whom are native speakers of Japanese, the majority of pre-collegiate teachers are native speakers of English. Almost all are certified, but in most cases, for subjects other than Japanese. Certification requirements for Japanese have been established in only a limited number of states. In general, they are modeled after requirements for cognate languages like French and Spanish and show little recognition of the special features of Japanese as a Category 4 (most difficult for Americans to learn) language.

2. The principal criteria by which a pre-collegiate teacher is hired are general knowledge of Japanese and training as a Japanese teacher, but assessments of these criteria are made by school principals who usually have little background or experience in this area and nowhere to turn for guidance. Judging by the limited extent to which many teachers have studied the language, a considerable number of pre-collegiate Japanese teachers have only limited qualifications to teach the language and a tendency to overestimate their own competence ratings.

3. The vast majority of postsecondary teachers of Japanese are native Japanese, and even those who are non-Japanese are, nonetheless, well qualified in Japanese. However, requirements for being able to teach Japanese as a foreign language seem lax, and there is little provision for on-the-job training.

4. The Japanese pre-collegiate curricula depend largely on idiosyncratic decisions made by individual instructors, who may be inexperienced and the products of very limited training. Their preparation of teaching materials has become a cottage industry, with most output being used only at the institution at which they were prepared. The instruction of *kanji* shows tremendous variation, with the native Japanese instructors generally introducing them initially at a faster rate. Although most teachers begin with romanization, some begin with the native writing system from the first day.

5. The students themselves want more instruction in speaking: Of the pre-collegiate students who would like a change in their curriculum (two-thirds of those surveyed), twice as many want more speaking as those who want more reading. When asked their purpose in taking Japanese, even the collegiate students listed a desire to speak Japanese fluently as their primary linguistic reason.

6. There is a question as to how many students are being taught to handle authentic Japanese. It appears that in many Japanese courses there is rather an emphasis on speaking "English in Japanese," that is, speaking Japanese by translating the English appropriate to a given situation. Japanese behavioral (acquired) culture is being given only limited attention, at best, and too few students are learning the implications of studying a "truly foreign language." Japanese is not simply "tough French." This problem is particularly noticeable among the pupils of Japanese in first and second grades in elementary school, who are still at a formative stage in their own native behavioral cultural development.

7. Few pre-collegiate schools have any special requirements for enrolling in Japanese courses, but self-selection seems to have thus far attracted a superior group of students, judging by their overall records and their enthusiasm for schoolwork in general. Nevertheless, of the student sample, a significant percentage of those who had studied in high school, including 42 percent of those who had studied for all four years, began their Japanese study in college as first-year, first-semester beginners. Equally surprising is the fact that slightly more than one-half of the surveyed college teachers find that, after six weeks of study, students who have studied in high school perform at about the same level as those without that experience. At that point in the course, only 37 percent of the college teachers feel the high school alumni have an advantage, and 8 percent believe that they are worse than true beginners. As high school courses in Japanese become more generally available, the self-selectivity of the students may decline, resulting in even less advanced placement in college.

8. Students of Japanese—both pre-collegiate and collegiate—express primary interest in careers related to business. Their reasons for studying Japanese are instrumental: They see Japanese as improving their job opportunities and are eager to study job-related Japanese. Major problems facing the field are, on the one hand, to give students a realistic expectation of the likelihood of their being able to use their Japanese skills, depending on the various amounts of language training they represent, and, on the other, tailoring what is taught a little more closely to expressed student goals.

9. Pre-collegiate curricula, so recently developed except in the case of the few long-established programs, do not, as yet, reflect a generally agreed-upon course of study, nor generally accepted standards. Many programs place heavy emphasis on reading and writing. Some stress vocabulary learning and the study of isolated sentences as an oral component. More native-speaker instructors include game playing and singing songs as part of their curricula. Little emphasis seems to be placed on the use of language as communication. A College Board/NFLC project, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, for the development of curricular guidelines for high school Japanese programs is currently under way that aims to establish more generally accepted procedures and standards. College programs are beginning to expand their curricular offerings with courses on business Japanese and for other special purposes, but these usually follow, and are taken in addition to, a sequence of regular beginning, intermediate, and (perhaps) advanced all-skills courses that differ in approach and emphasis from school to school. This variation clearly contributes to the problems of articulation between high school and college.

10. No provisions have been made, thus far, to provide for meaningful evaluation of Japanese language programs or students on a regular basis. Tests are a local matter, prepared by local staffs, and they are as varied as the programs themselves. Insofar as standardized tests exist, they are rarely used in pre-collegiate or collegiate Japanese programs. Fortunately, as result of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to the College Board and NFLC, a College Board Achievement Test in Japanese is now in preparation.

11. Attrition in enrollments in Japanese courses is high. Given the difficulty Americans encounter in learning Japanese, this means that most end their study of the language long before they have acquired a useful proficiency and long before they might indeed be able to use it to improve their job opportunities. According to the surveyed high school teachers, important reasons for this attrition are the difficulty of the language, failure to get high grades, and lack of dedication. These reasons should be noted in light of the fact that the Japanese students tend to be a superior group; that they do, in fact, get good grades in Japanese; and that 40.4 percent of them spend 10 percent or less of their homework time on Japanese. Several students took the trouble to add comments to their questionnaires complaining about not learning anything and not being challenged in their Japanese courses. It is not surprising that in these new programs, many of which are three years old or less, appropriate standards have not yet been established.

12. Totally lacking in the pre-collegiate Japanese language field is any unified notion of a goal. The commonly expressed assumption that "the younger, the better" is used to support the belief that by beginning language training during the pre-collegiate years, students will be able to gain greater levels of proficiency in college than have thus far been achieved. In contrast, the slow rate of progress made in so many of the high school programs and the general lack of interest in articulation among both high school and college teachers suggest that the goal is, in fact, different. It would appear, in many cases, to be rather a general introduction to Japan, including much that is not related to language learning at all.

13. The growth of extensive networks teaching Japanese through distance learning technologies is another example of healthy experimentation in ways of meeting sudden and dispersed increases in student demand. However, two primary problems were highlighted by this survey: First, these experiments tend to be enclaved and neither draw sufficiently upon general developments in Japanese language instruction, nor provide information as to what is learned in this new technology that feeds into the mainstream of that instruction. Second, it is time to develop accurate testing strategies, both to address questions of the relative contribution of distance learning technology to the learning of Japanese and to serve as feedback on student progress as they proceed.

Investment Strategy: Projects Suggested by Survey Results

1. Establishment of teacher training programs: summer, full-time intensive workshops, of nine weeks duration, taught by specialists in Japanese language pedagogy.

a. *For Pre-Collegiate Teachers*: Some joint sessions and some divided sessions for native/nonnative speakers of Japanese. Native speakers of Japanese will concentrate on the way to teach their native language/behavioral culture when students are Americans. They will also receive detailed information on serving as a faculty member of an American pre-collegiate institution. Nonnative instructors will focus on how to utilize audio and videotapes, computerized programs, and Japanese visitors when one's own competence in Japanese is nonnative. Those desiring to improve their Japanese language facility will have the opportunity to serve as subjects in hands-on teaching demonstrations by the native speaker instructors, thereby providing a byproduct of the workshops. As a further dividend, suggestions for appropriate requirements for pre-collegiate certification in Japanese will be drawn up and circulated to state departments of education.

b. *For Postsecondary Teachers:* Discussions of a unified theory of Japanese language pedagogy; the concept of "language program"; teaching the four skills and how they relate; pacing; evaluation; the relation between language and behavioral (acquired) culture; and the complementary roles of the native and nonnative instructor. Extensive hands-on practice teaching with detailed critiquing by staff, colleagues, and students.

2. Establishment of a limited number of experimental, model pre-collegiate programs, both academic-year courses and summer intensive courses, using highly trained personnel and apprentice teachers. A number of different curricula will be developed, for purposes of comparison. A special program for students interested in only a limited period of Japanese language study will also be included. The results will be tested and compared with all types of current programs, both part-time and intensive.

3. *Study Abroad:* An in-depth study of actual value added by study abroad and research into how time spent in the foreign setting can be made maximally productive. What is the ideal point in the curriculum for study in Japan? What problems, if any, arise when students return to an ongoing domestic program after study abroad? Of primary importance is a next-stage survey of Japanese language instruction for Americans in Japan. If the whole system is to be examined, in-country language instruction must be considered together with stateside instruction.

4. Development of an innovative four-year collegiate curricular design that reflects current student instrumental goals for studying the language. Multiple tracking, for those students with more traditional interests, would also be provided. Provision must also be made for many students planning only one or two years of study, who are not interested in simply the beginning portion of a course aiming at specialization.

5. An in-depth study of high enrollment attrition—its causes and its possible cures—in pre-collegiate and collegiate Japanese programs. According to the surveyed teachers, the amount of out-of-class time that Japanese study requires is a significant contributing factor. Yet, some of the most demanding programs have among the lowest attrition rates. Is there a connection with the nature of the homework and/or the overall

curriculum? This project calls for surveying students who actually terminated their study of Japanese prior to leaving school.

6. Research on the ideal age for beginning the study of Japanese in U.S. schools. Is there any truth to the widely held assumption that "the earlier the better"? Can first and second grade pupils learn to speak Japanese, or are they simply being taught how to speak "English in Japanese"? Can young children be taught a totally different behavioral cultural system in the classroom, when their own native system in still in a formative stage? Is the amount of material covered in the lower grades learned more quickly later? Is there value to a foreigner's learning Japanese children's language, or should the foreign child be taught only adult speech?

7. Research on romanization: The battle about romanization continues unabated, demanding serious empirical research. What effect, if any, does the use of romanization have on a student's pronunciation, delivery (including fluency), and later ability to read? How is romanization best used, if at all? For what purposes, if any, do students actually use romanization on a continuing basis outside the classroom?

8. Development of graded tests on speaking competence, for use in pre-collegiate and in collegiate programs, that measure ability from elementary to advanced levels. Such tests should be prepared in collaboration with testing specialists and validated through pre-testing.

9. Expansion of the present ETS test in listening and reading proficiency, to include items representing more elementary and more advanced levels. At least four versions of the new test should be developed. Again, collaboration with testing specialists and validation through pre-testing should be a requirement of the project.

10. A study of distance learning as a means of teaching Japanese language. Using the College Board Japanese Achievement Test now in preparation, locate the position of students on the rating scale who have been taught Japanese exclusively through distance learning programs. Are there differences in the overall results of different distance learning programs? Can any such differences be attributed to specific features of individual programs? Are there features or procedures of all the programs that might be changed to effect an improvement in results?

11. Development of a special curriculum for postcollegiate professionals who have insufficient study time to develop a professional level competence in Japanese, but who need to interact with Japanese professionally and socially. Such a curriculum will include discussion of the general structure of this "truly foreign language," the interrelation between the language and Japanese behavioral (acquired) culture, the way to use an interpreter, and how to speak English with Japanese. As part of the project, a maximally effective, elementary part-time program in the language will be developed.

12. Support for graduate students interested in undertaking research projects related to Japanese language pedagogy as a dissertation subject. The paucity of such dissertations, compared to those in literature and linguistics, is striking.

As important as deciding where support funds should be allocated (a few of the most important of which have been listed above) are decisions on where *not* to spend them. The monies that are available for Japanese language training are obviously limited and must be used effectively. It is time to replace the three-day workshop with teacher training programs of meaningful length. It is time to give up supporting the individual program that will have no impact beyond its own campus. It is time to give up supporting the language teaching project organized by someone with no language teaching credentials. And it is time to build requirements for serious evaluation by professionals in the field into every research proposal—both before it is accepted and during its lifetime. With assistance effectively appropriated and with true commitment on the part of all those involved, Japanese language instruction has the potential to become a leader in the field of foreign language teaching.

Appendix A

Working Committee

Emiko Konomi
Assistant Professor of Japanese
Williams College

David O. Mills
Associate Professor of Japanese Language and Linguistics
University of Pittsburgh

Hiroshi Miyaji
Professor of Philosophy and Head, Japan Program
Middlebury College

Tazuko Monane
Professor of the Practice of the Japanese Language
Harvard University

Mari Noda
Assistant Professor of Japanese
The Ohio State University

Charles Quinn
Assistant Professor of Japanese
The Ohio State University

S. Robert Ramsey
Professor of Hebrew and East Asian Linguistics
University of Maryland

Robert J. Sukle
Director
Japanese FALCON Program
Cornell University

Appendix B

Site Visit Team

Emiko Konomi
Assistant Professor of Japanese
Williams College

Mari Noda
Assistant Professor of Japanese
The Ohio State University

Charles Quinn
Assistant Professor of Japanese
The Ohio State University

S. Robert Ramsey
Professor of Hebrew and East Asian Linguistics
University of Maryland

Robert J. Sukle
Director
Japanese FALCON Program
Cornell University

Patricia Wetzel
Associate Professor of Japanese
Portland State University

Jonathan H. Wolff
Japanese Language Research Associate
National Foreign Language Center

Appendix C

Participants in Conference on Pre-Collegiate Japanese Language Education

David Arlington
Specialist
Humanities and Foreign Languages
Oregon Department of Education

Carol A. Bond
Director
Center for the Improvement of Teaching of Japanese Language and Culture in High School
University High School, Illinois

Linda Bunney-Sarhad
Director
Institute for International Studies
California State University-Stanislaus

Timothy Cook
Instructor of Japanese
Nebraska ETV

June Donenfeld
Former Program Officer
United States-Japan Foundation
New York, N.Y.

Eric J. Gangloff
Executive Director
Japan-United States Friendship Commission
Washington, D.C.

Sukero Ito
Assistant Director
Department of Critical Languages
University of Alabama

Fred C. Lorish
Instructor of Japanese
South Eugene High School, Oregon

Jean Morden
Instructor of Japanese
Reitaku Institute for Cultural Exchange
Washington, D.C.

Mel Nielsen
Foreign Language Consultant
Nebraska Department of Education

Appendix D: Pre-Collegiate Respondents to Japanese Survey

Institutions (N=146)	Principals (N=39)	Teachers (N=146)	Students (N=1,185)
Indiana			
Anderson High School, Anderson, IN		X	
Banneker Elementary School, Gary, IN		X	
Blackford High School, Hartford City, IN	X	X	X
Brownsburg High School, Brownsburg, IN		X	
Columbus East High School, Columbus, IN	X		X
Connersville High School, Connersville, IN	X	X	X
Custer Baker Middle School, Franklin, IN		X	
Greencastle High School, Greencastle, IN	X	X	
Hamilton Southeastern High School, Noblesville, IN	X	X	X
Harrison High School, Evansville, IN	X	X	X
Harrison High School, West Lafayette, IN		X	
Jefferson High School, Lafayette, IN		X[1]	X
La Porte High School, La Porte, IN		X	
LaSalle High School, South Bend, IN	X		
McCutcheon High School, Lafayette, IN		X	
Mishawaka High School, Mishawaka, IN	X	X	X
Pendleton Heights High School, Pendleton, IN	X	X	X
Richmond High School, Richmond, IN		X	
South Vigo High School, Terre Haute, IN	X	X	X
West Lafayette High School, West Lafayette, IN		X[1]	X
Michigan			
Clinton Center for Advanced Studies, Oak Park, MI	X		
Eisenhower High School, MI		X[1]	X
Foreign Language Immersion School, Detroit, MI	X	X	
Groves High School, Birmingham, MI		X	X
Henry Ford High School, Sterling Heights, MI		X[1]	X
Stevenson High School, MI		X[1]	X
Seaholm HS, Birmingham, MI	X	X	X
Utica High School, MI		X[1]	X
Weber Middle School, Detroit, MI	X		
New York			
Bronx High School of Science, Bronx, NY		X	X
Commack High School, Commack, NY		X	

Institutions (N=146)	**Principals (N=39)**	**Teachers (N=140)**	**Students (N=1,185)**
Curtis High School, Staten Island, NY	X	X	X
Francis Lewis High School, Flushing, NY		X[1]	X
Hillcrest High School, Jamaica, NY		X	
IS 145, Jackson Heights, NY	X	X	
IS 2279, E. Elmhurst, NY	X		
John Bowne High School, Flushing, NY		X	
Owego Free Academy, Owego, NY	X	X	X
North Tonwanda Senior High School, N. Tonwanda, NY		X	X
Parsons Memorial Elementary School, Harrison, NY	X	X	
Port Richmond High School, Staten Island, NY		X	
Riverdale Country School, Bronx, NY	X	X	X
United Nations Int'l School, New York, NY		X	X
Stuyvesant High School, New York, NY			
Townsend Harris High School, Flushing, NY	X	X[1]	X
Oregon			
Aloha High School, Beaverton, OR		X	X
Cal Young Middle School, Eugene, OR	X	X	
Cleveland High School, Portland, OR		X	
Corvallis High School, Corvallis, OR		X	
Gresham High School, Gresham, OR		X	X
Grant High School, Portland, OR	X	X	X
Forest Grove High School, Forest Grove, OR	X	X	X
Hillsboro High School, Hillsboro, OR	X	X	X
Lake Oswego High School, Lake Oswego, OR		X	
Lincoln High School, Portland, OR	X	X	X
North Salem High School, Salem, OR		X	X
Ontario Senior High School, Ontario, OR	X	X	X
Rieke TAG Center, Portland, OR	X	X	
Sam Barlow High School, Gresham, OR	X	X	X
Sheldon High School, Eugene, OR	X	X	X
South Eugene High School, Eugene, OR	X	X	X
South Medford High School, Medford, OR		X	
Waldport High School, Waldport, OR		X	
West Albany High School, Albany, OR	X	X	X
West Linn High School, West Linn, OR	X	X	X

Institutions (N=146)	Principals (N=39)	Teachers (N=140)	Students (N=1,185)
Yujin Gakuen, Eugene, OR	X		
Alaska			
Kodiak High School, Kodiak, AK		X	
Mountain Village High School, Mountain Village, AK		X	
Mt. Edgecumbe High School, Sitka, AK	X	X	X
Service High School, Anchorage, AK	X	X	X
Arizona			
Central High School, Phoenix, AZ		X	
Mesa High School, Mesa, AZ		X	
California			
Alisal High School,Salinas, CA		X	
Cerritos High School, Cerritos, CA		X	
Gardena High School, Gardena, CA		X	
George Washington High School, San Fransisco, CA		X	
Merced High School, Merced, CA		X	
Moorpark High School, Moorpark, CA		X	
North High School, Torrance, CA		X	
Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto, CA		X	
Saratoga High School, Saratoga, CA		X	
Tokay High School, Lodi, CA		X	
Turlock High School, Turlock, CA		X	
Colorado			
Centaurus High School, Lafayette, CO		X	
Fairview High School, Boulder, CO		X	
West High School, Denver, CO		X	
Washington, DC			
St. Alban's School, Washington, D.C.		X	
Florida			
Dr. Phillips High School, Orlando, FL		X	
Hawaii			
Baldwin High School, Wailuku, HI		X	
Hawaii Preparatory Academy, Kamuela, HI		X	
Kailua High School, Kailua, HI		X	
Kapaa High School, Kapaa, HI		X	
Leilehua High School, Wahiawa, HI		X	

Institutions (N=146)	Principals (N=39)	Teachers (N=140)	Students (N=1,185)
Maui High School, Kahului, HI		X	
Pearl City High School, Pearl City, HI		X	
Punahou School, Honolulu, HI		X	
Waialua High School, Waialua, HI		X	
Illinois			
Elk Grove High School, Elk Grove Village, IL		X	
IL Oak Park & River Forest High Schools, Oak Park, IL		X	
Rock Island High School, Rock Island, IL		X	
Kentucky			
Bryan Station Senior High School, Lexington, KY		X	
Hart County High School, Munsfordville, KY		X	
Massachusetts			
Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, MA		X	
Maryland			
Eleanor Roosevelt High School, Greenbelt, MD		X	
Walt Whitman High School, Bethesda, MD		X	
Minnesota			
Washburn High School, Minneapolis, MN		X	
Missouri			
Central High School, Springfield, MO		X	
Ft. Osage High School, Independence, MO		X	
North Carolina			
Charlotte County Day School, Charlotte, NC		X	
Nevada			
Bonanza High School, Las Vegas, NV		X	
New Hampshire			
St. Paul's School, Concord, NH	X	X	X
New Jersey			
Kearny High School, Kearny, NJ		X	
New Mexico			
Career Enrichment Center, Albuquerque, NM		X	
Ohio			
E.L. Bowsher High School, Toledo, OH		X	
Fort Hayes Metropolitan Ed. Center, Columbus, OH		X	

Institutions (N=146)	Principals (N=39)	Teachers (N=140)	Students (N=1,185)
Oklahoma			
Booker T. Washington High School, Tulsa, OK		X	X
Virginia			
Booker T. Washington High School, Norfolk, VA		X	
Monacan High School, Richmond, VA		X	
Oakton High School, Vienna, VA	X		
Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology, Fairfax, VA	X		X
Washington			
Blanchet High School, Bellingham, WA		X	
Bothell Senior High School, Bothell, WA		X	
Capital High School, Olympia, WA		X	
Charles Wright Academy, Tacoma, WA		X	
Decatur High School, Federal Way, WA		X	
Eastmont High School, Everett, WA		X	
Federal Way Senior High School, Federal Way, WA		X	
Ferris High School, Spokane, WA		X	
Mt. Tahoma High School, Tacoma, WA		X	
Hudson's Bay High School, Vancouver, WA		X	
Kentridge High School, Kent, WA		X	
Lake Washington High School, Kirkland, WA		X	
Lewis & Clark High School, Spokane, WA		X	
Lindbergh High School, Renton, WA		X	
Mark Morris High School, Longview, WA		X	
Marysville-Pilchuck High School, Marysville, WA		X	
North Central High School, Spokane, WA		X	
Onalaska High School, Onalaska, WA		X	
Renton High School, Renton, WA		X	
Toledo High School, Toledo, WA		X	
Stadium High School, Tacoma WA		X	
Wisconsin			
Merrill Senior High School, Merrill, WI		X	
Wauwatosa East High School, Wauwatosa, WI		X	
Wauwatosa West High School, Wauwatosa, WI		X	

[1] Teaches at more than one school.

Appendix E: Postsecondary Respondents to Japanese Survey

Institutions (N=251)	General (N=156)	Program Administrators (N=35)	Teachers (N=180)	Students (N=669)
Akron, University of	X			
Alabama - Birmingham, University of				X[2]
Alabama - Tuscaloosa, University of		X	X	X
Alaska - Anchorage, University of	X			
Alaska - Fairbanks, University of				X
Alaska Pacific University	X			
American Grad School of International Management	X	X	X	
Amherst College			X	
Appalachian State University	X			
Arizona State University			X	
Arkansas Tech University	X		X[1]	
Arkansas - Little Rock, University of	X		X[1]	
Ashland College (OH)	X			
Ball State University (IN)	X			
Bates College	X			
Beaver College				X[2]
Beloit College (WI)		X		X
Bellevue Community College (WA)	X			
Bemidji State University (MN)	X		X[1]	
Berea College (KY)				X[2]
Bethel College (MN)	X			
Big Bend Community College (WA)	X			
Blackburn College (IL)			X[1]	
Black Hawk College (IL)	X			
Boston College	X			
Boston University	X			
Brenau College (GA)			X[1]	
Brigham Young University			X	X
Brooklyn College, CUNY			X[1]	
Buena Vista College (IA)	X			
Cabrillo College (CA)		X	X	X
California State University - Bakersfield			X[1]	
California State University - Fresno		X	X	X

Institutions (N=251)	**General (N=156)**	**Program Administrators (N=35)**	**Teachers (N=180)**	**Students (N=669)**
California State University - Fullerton	X			
California State University - Hayward	X			
California State University - Northridge	X			
California State University - Sacramento	X			
California State University - Stanislaus	X			
California - Berkeley, University of		X	X	X
California - Davis, University of	X			
California - San Diego, University of	X			
Carleton College (MN)	X			
Carnegie Mellon University		X		
Case Western Reserve University			X	
Catonsville Community College (MD)	X			
Centralia College (WA)	X			
Central Michigan University	X			
Cerritos College (CA)	X			
Chemeketa Community College (OR)	X			
Chicago, University of			X	X
Clackamas Community College (OR)	X			
Coastline Community College (CA)	X			
Colby College	X			
Colgate University	X			
Colorado College	X			
Colorado - Boulder, University of		X	X	X
Colorado - Colorado Springs, University of	X			
Columbia University		X	X	X
Concordia College (OR)			X[1]	
Concordia College (OR)			X[1]	
Cornell University	X		X	
De Anza College (CA)	X			
Delaware, University of	X			
Denison University	X			
De Paul University (IL)	X			
De Pauw Univesity			X[1]	
Drexel University	X			X[2]

Institutions (N=251)	General (N=156)	Program Administrators (N=35)	Teachers (N=180)	Students (N=669)
Duke University		X	X	X
Earlham College		X	X	X
East Tennessee State University			X[1]	
East Texas University			X[1]	
Eckerd College (FL)	X			
Fairleigh Dickinson University	X			
Findlay, University of (OH)			X	
Florida State University	X			
Foothill College (CA)	X			
George Mason University	X			
Georgetown University			X	
George Washington University			X	X
Georgia Southern College	X			
Georgia State University	X			
Glendale Community College (AZ)	X			
Glendale Community College (CA)	X			
Grinnell College				X[2]
Guam Community College	X			
Guam, University of				X
Gustavus Adolphus College (MN)	X			
Hartford, University of			X[1]	
Harvard University	X			
Hawaii at Manoa, University of	X			
Hawaii Loa College	X			
Highline Community College (WA)	X			
Hobart & William Smith Colleges	X			
Hope College (MI)	X			
Illinois - Urbana, University of		X	X	X
Indiana University - Bloomington	X		X	
Indiana University of Pennsylvania			X[1]	
Iowa, University of		X	X	X
Jacksonville State University (AL)			X[1]	
James Madison University	X			
John Carroll University (OH)	X			

Institutions (N=251)	**General** (N=156)	**Program Administrators** (N=35)	**Teachers** (N=180)	**Students** (N=669)
Johnson County Community College (KS)	X			
John Tyler Community College (VA)		X		X
Juniata College (PA)			X[1]	
Kauai Community College	X			
Kearney State College (NJ)			X[1]	
Kenyon College (OH)	X			
Lafayette College	X			
La Salle Univeristy	X			
Lamar University (TX)			X[1]	
Lander College (SC)			X[1]	
Lauder Institute of Management, University of Pennsylvania	X	X		
Leeward Community College (HI)		X	X	X
Lehigh University	X			
Linfield College (OR)	X			
Lock Haven University			X[1]	
Lower Columbia College (WA)	X			
Macalester College			X	
Madonna College (MI)	X			
Marietta College (OH)	X			
Maryland, University of			X	
Marymount College (CA)	X			
Maryville College (TN)	X			
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	X			
Memphis State University	X			
Mesa Community College (AZ)	X			
Miami University (OH)	X			
Michigan, University of		X	X	X
Michigan State University	X		X	
Micronesia, Community College of	X			
Middlebury College			X	X
Middle Tennessee State University	X			
Millersville University (PA)			X[1]	
Milwaukee School of Engineering			X[1]	
Mississippi, University of	X		X[1]	

Institutions (N=251)	**General (N=156)**	**Program Administrators (N=35)**	**Teachers (N=180)**	**Students (N=669)**
Mississippi State University		X	X	X
Missouri - Columbia, University of	X			
Montana, University of	X			
Monterey Institute of International Studies	X	X	X	
Mt. Hood Community College (OR)		X	X	X
Mt. San Antonio College (CA)	X			
Mundelein College				X[2]
Nebraska, University of	X			
Nebraska Weslayan University			X[1]	
Nevada - Reno, University of	X			
New Hampshire, University of		X	X	X
New Mexico, University of	X			
New School for Social Research	X			
Normandale Community College (MN)	X			
North Carolina - Charlotte, University of	X			
North Carolina State University	X			
Northeast Missouri State University			X[1]	
Northwest Missouri State University			X[1]	
Northern Illinois University (IL)	X			
Northern Kentucky University		X		X
Northern Virginia Community College (Annandale)	X			
Northern Virginia Community College (Woodbridge)	X			
Northland College (WI)	X			
Northern Colorado, University of	X			
Northwestern University (IL)		X	X	X
Oakland University (MI)	X			
Oakton Community College (IL)	X			
Oberlin College	X			
Ohio State University		X		X
Ohio Dominican College	X			
Ohio Wesleyan University			X[1]	
Old Dominion University	X			
Oklahoma, University of	X			
Orange Coast College (CA)	X			

Institutions (N=251)	**General (N=156)**	**Program Administrators (N=35)**	**Teachers (N=180)**	**Students (N=669)**
Oregon Institute of Technology			X^1	
Pace University-White Plains Campus		X	X	X
Pacific, University of (CA)	X			
Pennsylvania State University	X			
Pittsburgh, University of			X	
Portland, University of			X^1	
Portland State University		X	X	X
Providence Colege			X^1	
Princeton University		X		X
Puerto Rico, University of		X	X	X
Puget Sound, University of	X			
Purdue University (IN)	X			
Purdue University - Calumet (IN)		X		X
Queens College, CUNY	X			
Quinnipiac College	X			
Rhode Island, University of		X	X	X
Rhodes College (TN)	X			
Rochester Institute of Technology				X^2
Rochester, University of	X			
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology (IN)	X		X^1	
Rutgers University	X			
Sacramento City College	X			
Saint Bonaventure University	X		X^1	
Saint Cloud State University (MN)	X			
Saint Lawerence University	X			
St. Michael's College (VT)	X			
Saint Rose, College of (NY)			X^1	
San Diego, University of	X		X^1	
San Fransisco State University	X			
Santa Rosa Junior College (CA)	X			
Scott Community College (IA)	X			
Seattle Community College	X			
Seton Hill College				X^2
Simon's Rock of Bard College				X^2

Institutions (N=251)	General (N=156)	Program Administrators (N=35)	Teachers (N=180)	Students (N=669)
Skidmore College	X			
Slippery Rock University	X		X[1]	
South Alabama, University of	X			
Southern California, University of	X			
Southern Connecticut University	X			
South Florida, University of	X			
South Seattle Community College	X			
Stanford University		X	X	X
SUNY, College at Albany			X	
SUNY, College at Binghamton	X			
SUNY, College at Buffalo	X			
SUNY, College at New Paltz	X		X	
SUNY, College at Oneonta				X[2]
Temple University		X	X	X
Texas A&M University	X			
Texas at Austin, University of		X	X	X
Texas at El Paso, University of	X			
Texas Technical University			X[1]	
Towson State University	X			
Tufts University	X			
Tulsa Jr College	X		X	X
Umpqua Community College (OR)	X			
US Naval Academy		X	X	X
Utah, University of			X	X
Virginia Commonwealth U.	X			
Wake Forest University	X			
Washington, University of	X			
Weber State College	X			
Wells College				X
Weslyan College (GA)			X[1]	
Weslyan University (CT)			X	
West Georgia College	X			
Western Oregon State College	X			
Western Washington University	X			

Institutions (N=251)	**General** (N=156)	**Program Administrators** (N=35)	**Teachers** (N=180)	**Students** (N=669)
West Virginia University	X			
Wheaton College (MA)			X[1]	
Wilkes University	X			
Willamette University (OR)	X			
William and Mary, College of	X			
Williams College		X	X	X
Windward Community College (HI)	X			
Wisconsin-Eau Claire, University of	X		X[1]	
Wisconsin - Madison, University of		X	X	X
Wisconsin - Oshkosh, University of			X	
Wichita State University			X	
Wright State University (OH)	X			
Wyoming, University of	X		X[1]	
Yale University	X			

[1] Survey of Educational Exchange Program teachers

[2] Self-Instructional Language Program students

NFLC

The National Foreign Language Center

at The Johns Hopkins University
1619 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036